МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ

КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

імені професора Г. Г. Почепцова

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики
на тему:

«СТРАТЕГІЇ І ТАКТИКИ ВВІЧЛИВОСТІ В СУЧАСНОМУ АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ДІАЛОГІЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ»

Допущено до захисту

«___» _____ року

студента групи МЛа 51-19
факультету германської філології
освітньо-професійної програми
сучасні філологічні студії (англійська мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
спеціалізація 035.041 Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно), перша – англійська
Бережної Марії Олександрівни

Завідувач кафедри
Шутова М.О.

Науковий керівник:
канд. пед. наук, доц. Соколець І.І.

_____

(підпис)   (ПІБ)

Національна шкала   _____
Кількість балів   _____
Оцінка ЄКТС   _____

КИЇВ – 2020

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Professor G.G.Pocheptsov Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Master's Qualification Paper

POLITENESS STRATEGIES AND TACTICS IN MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE

MARIA BEREZHNA

Group MLa 51-19

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **Iryna I. Sokolets**

PhD (Pedagogy)

Kyiv –2020

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Since the early 90's of the twentieth century, the research of politeness phenomenon has been experiencing dynamic changes, which are relevant for many social sciences, in particular: psychology, pragmatics, intercultural communication, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics. It is linguistics which has had a privileged role in politeness research, both because of its contributions, which will be reviewed in this Master's paper, and because language is the medium of much politeness. Moreover, the category of linguistic politeness is the main regulator of the behaviour of interlocutors.

As a complex linguistic and non-linguistic phenomenon, politeness has been approached from different disciplinary angles. Sociological aspects of the category of politeness are widely represented in the studies of B. Fraser (1990), O. Nwoye (1992), R. W. Janney & H. Arndt (1992), S. Ide (1989), and T. Larina (2003). Among the researchers who study politeness within the theory of conversational maxims are P. Grice (1967), R. Lakoff (1973), and G. Leech (1983). The psychological aspect of politeness is thoroughly explored in the monograph *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (1987) by P. Brown and S. Levinson, who distinguish between positive politeness aimed at establishing a good rapport between interlocutors, and negative politeness, which helps to reduce communicative pressure on the addressee and show the addressor's respect for the addressee's space in communication.

Nowadays, there is also a significant increase of academic interest in the analytical procedure for the functioning of politeness phenomenon in various discursive practices. However, the characteristic features of verbalization of strategies and tactics of positive politeness in English matrimonial discourse have not yet been explored.

The topicality of this research originates from the overall interest of contemporary linguistics in analysis of different types of discursive practices as well as from the lack of comprehensive analysis of local strategies and tactics of positive politeness in English matrimonial discourse.

The novelty of the Paper lies within a comprehensive analysis of the speech implementation of strategies and tactics of positive politeness in English matrimonial discourse on the material of discursive fragments from the TV series *This Is Us*.

The object of the research is strategies and tactics of positive politeness in English matrimonial discourse.

The subject-matter of the Paper is linguistic means of implementing strategies and tactics of positive politeness in English matrimonial discourse.

The aim of the Paper is to investigate the characteristic features of verbalization of strategies and tactics of positive politeness in English matrimonial discourse.

In accordance with the aim, the following **tasks** were set:

- to analyze major theories of politeness, namely: the social-norm view; the conversational-maxim view; the face-saving view; and the conversational-contract view;
- to define the classification of politeness strategies;
- to reveal pragmatic characteristics of dialogical discourse;
- to specify means of verbalization of positive politeness strategies in English matrimonial discourse.

The methodology used in this Master's paper is conditioned by the aim, the object, and the tasks of the research and embraces the following methods: the methods of inductive and deductive analysis were resorted to in order to collect, generalize, and systemize the material under consideration as well as to outline theoretical background and make conclusions; pragmalinguistic analysis was applied for defining illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.

The research and detailed analysis of strategies and tactics of positive politeness is based on the TV series *This Is Us*.

Theoretical value of the Paper is its contribution to pragmatics and theoretical studies of positive politeness strategies in English dialogical discourse.

Practical value of the work is the application of its results of the research in the classes of practical English, both spoken and written. The results can be applicable to writing students' papers, diploma papers and post-graduates' researches.

Compositionally, the Paper consists of Introduction, two Chapters, Conclusions to each Chapter and General Conclusions to the Paper, Résumé in Ukrainian, the List of References and the List of Illustration Materials.

Introduction presents the object and the subject of the investigation, underlines the topicality of the problem under study, the novelty of the gained results, sets the main aim and the tasks by which it is achieved, considers the methods of research used in the paper.

Chapter One "Theoretical background of studying politeness in modern English dialogical discourse" provides a review of theoretical issues related to the research and reveals pragmatic characteristics of dialogical discourse.

Chapter Two "Verbalization of positive politeness strategies in matrimonial discourse" explores strategies and tactics of positive politeness, which focus on forming close relationships between interlocutors to improve interpersonal interaction.

General Conclusion gives an overview of the main results of the research and defines the scope for the future study.

CHAPTER ONE
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF STUDYING POLITENESS IN
MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE

1.1. The concept of the politeness principle in linguistics

Politeness is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. It is an integral part of people's daily lives which permeates all human interaction. Therefore, it is quite natural that scientists from different fields devote their researches to this phenomenon, applying various concepts and approaches. Among the variety of the concepts and interpretations of the category of politeness in linguistics, it is worth distinguishing and analyzing the following: the social-norm view; the conversational-maxim view; the face-saving view; and the conversational-contract view.

1.1.1. The social-norm view. The proponents of the social-norm view, within which politeness is understood as a social norm, recognize the existence in every society of "a particular set of social norms consisting of more or less explicit rules that prescribe a certain behavior, a state of affairs, or a way of thinking in a context" (Fraser, 1990, p. 220). According to O. Nwoye (1992), within the social norm view politeness is "seen as arising from an awareness of one's social obligations to the other members of the group to which one owes primary allegiance" (p. 312). S. Ida (1989) identifies politeness with "discernment" (*wakimaei*), which is "the practice of polite behavior according to social conventions" (p. 223), as, for instance, the difference between a formal address "vous" and an informal "tu" in French. Thus, from the social-norm view politeness is directly related to the interpersonal communication regulated by etiquette, social norms, and conventions, and is determined by cultural codes and values of society.

Most linguists consider that the category of politeness as a social norm is closely connected with speech etiquette. A positive evaluation (politeness) correlates with a situation where "an action is in congruence with the norm" and a negative

evaluation (rudeness, aggressiveness) where "action is to the contrary" (Fraser, 1990, p. 220). In this sense, politeness is associated with what is called good manners, and thus falls into the sphere of etiquette. However, despite the direct link between etiquette and politeness, these concepts are usually distinguished and politeness is considered a broader concept than etiquette. If etiquette is defined as "a list of communicative norms and rules", then politeness is considered as "a system of communicative strategies and tactics used in real communication and aimed at achieving harmony and mutual understanding" (Larina, 2003, p. 52).

Researchers R. W. Janney and H. Arndt (1992) develop their own version of the vision of politeness and define it as "interpersonal" politeness as opposed to "social" politeness (p. 23). In order to distinguish between these two concepts, researchers propose to call them "social politeness" and "tact", which are differentiated by their functional area: "whereas the function of social politeness is essentially to coordinate social interaction – to regulate the mechanical exchange of roles and activities – the function of tact is quite different: namely to preserve face and regulate interpersonal relationships" (p. 24). Thus, it is tact that helps interlocutors to avoid conflicts in the process of communication. The opposition of social and interpersonal politeness helps to differentiate such concepts as politeness and tact: social politeness is primarily related to etiquette and has a static nature, and tact is a dynamic activity that plays a key role in shaping conflict-free and tolerant communication.

1.1.2. The conversational-maxim view. Among the researchers who study politeness within the theory of conversational maxims are P. Grice (1967), R. Lakoff (1973), and G. Leech (1983). The identification of politeness through? the maxims of verbal communication is based, first of all, on the classic work of P. Grice *Logic and Conversational* (1967). The hypothesis put forward by P. Grice that communication should be based on a principle that governs this process and is followed by all communicants served as the basis for the Cooperative Principle (CP). The basic assumption is that any discourse, whether written or spoken, is a joint effort and both the speaker and the addressee have to cooperate following certain

pragmatic, syntactic, and semantic rules in order to communicate effectively. P. Grice (1967) describes the CP as follows: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (p. 26). To put it more simply, the CP calls for what one has to say, at the time it has to be said, and in the manner in which it has to be said.

Grice attempted to specify the principles which regulate this cooperative behaviour, and proposed four "maxims" that should be obeyed as the rules by the participants of communication: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. The category of Quantity is represented by the following maxims: "Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)" and "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required" (p. 26). The essence of these postulates is that speakers should give enough information but not more than is needed for their conversational contribution.

The category of Quality includes the supermaxim "Try to make your contribution one that is true" and is represented by the following maxims: "Do not say what you believe to be false" and "Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence" (p. 27). According to these maxims, all participants of the conversation should express only truthful ideas. They ought to say only what they believe to be true or what they have evidence for.

The category of Relation is represented by a single maxim, namely, "Be relevant" which means that participants of the social interaction should speak to the point. Finally, the category of Manner includes the supermaxim "Be perspicuous" and is represented by the following maxims: "Avoid obscurity of expression"; "Avoid ambiguity"; "Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)" and "Be orderly" (p. 27). These maxims say that the interlocuters ought to speak clearly, avoiding ambiguous expressions, briefly, and in a logical order.

Grice believes that the speakers have to adhere to CP to produce utterances which are informative, true, relevant, and non-confusing. However, the maxims are often deliberately broken and clearly conflict with communicative strategies that are

constantly encountered in the conversation. This indicates politeness as the only reason for explaining the frequent violation of Gricean maxims. Contrary to Grice's theory, there is no difficulty in understanding and without adhering to these rules conflicts can often be avoided.

Since the cause of the violation of maxims is the concern about communicative relations, P. Grice himself makes an attempt to overcome this contradiction and introduces an additional maxim: "Be polite!" (p. 28). We believe that P. Grice's conceptual position on politeness is an important stage in the formation of the theory of linguistic politeness, and although he did not study the category of politeness as such, his maxims show its importance for successful communication and mutual understanding between interlocutors.

One of the first followers of P. Grice's ideas was R. Lakoff (1973) who further developed them in the article "The Logic of Politeness: or Minding Your P's and Q's", which is one of the first attempts to consider politeness in a pragmatic way. She offered the concept of politeness based on the pragmatic competence which consists of two rules: 1. "Be clear!" and 2. "Be polite!". Whereas the first rule encompasses Gricean maxims, the second one includes the following three rules of politeness:

1. Do not impose;
2. Give options;
3. Make the addressee feel good – be friendly (Lakoff, 1973, p. 298).

The rule "Be polite!" refers to the maxims of distance, deference, and camaraderie (Johnstone, 2008) which, according to Lakoff, should have a balance in interaction since all the three maxims cannot be available at the same time. Once the balance of such maxims is violated, social behaviour could be perceived as impolite.

R. Lakoff states that speakers employ the above-mentioned rules of politeness to either express politeness or avoid offence as a consequence of indicating speaker's/addressee's status. The first rule ("*Do not impose*") means that we need to keep distance with our interlocutor. Distance here means how close our

relationship is with the person we are talking to. This can be in terms of age, family relation, occupation, etc. This rule of politeness is usually applied when there is much social distance between the speaker and the hearer. We shall neither ask about their personal affairs nor tell them about ours. The use of a title and last name as a form of address, the preference of the passive voice to the active one, and the use of technical terms are examples of the implementation of this rule.

The second rule is "*Give options*". In order to be polite, we can't insist on our command, desire, or request to other people. In other words, hesitation is needed in a conversation. Therefore, we need to give options to our interlocutor in giving response: either to refuse or accept. This is usually achieved by using indirect speech, the word "*please*"; particles like "*well*", "*er*", and "*ah*"; euphemisms; hedges like "*kind of*", "*in a way*" and "*loosely speaking*", etc.

The maxim "*Make the addressee feel good – be friendly*" emphasizes closeness between the speaker and the hearer. It is believed that being nice and friendly to our interlocutor is a sign of courtesy. This sense of camaraderie or solidarity can be verbally expressed by the use of first names or nicknames which gives the impression of an informal relationship between the speaker and addressee; parentheses such as "*I mean*", "*like*" and "*you know*" which enable the speaker to show their feelings in the statements. Besides this, the linguistic manifestation of the third rule can also be realized by using compliments and euphemisms instead of taboo terms.

R. Lakoff's rules of politeness can be understood both as rules-recommendations, if taken together, and as "milestones", indicating segments of a continuous "scale" of various strategies for a person's social and communicative behaviour. If we consider the rules of politeness as segments of the continuum of speech behaviour, then each of the rules determines one of the main strategies: the preference for the first rule ("*Do not impose*") characterizes the "distance strategy", the preference for the third rule *("Make the addressee feel good – be friendly")* characterizes the opposite "proximity strategy", and the preference for second rule (*"Give options"*) implies the following "intermediate", "indefinite", "expectant"

communication strategy, when the right to choose the strategy of speech communication is granted to the partner" (Mikhalskaya, 1998, pp. 355-356).

The most fully developed theory of politeness from the position of conversational maxims is presented in Geoffrey Leech's work *Principles of Pragmatics* (1983). Analysing the conversational-maxim perspective, Fraser (1990) states that following Lakoff, "Leech adopts the framework set out by Grice: there exists a set of maxims and submaxims that guide and constrain the conversation of rational people" (p. 230). Relying on this framework, Leech proposed the Politeness Principle (PP), which is one of the main pragmatic principles governing relations between participants in a communicative act and has priority in everyday communication: "Minimise (other things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs" (Leech, 1983, p. 81). The essence of the Politeness Principle as a pragmatic phenomenon comes down to the fact that, directing his statements to achieve certain goals, the speaker must arrange them as if he (the speaker) proceeded from the interests of the interlocutor (listener). Because of this, in the division into "self" and others "others" is essential.

Another essential characteristic in Leech's theory is the distinction he makes between "absolute politeness" and "relative politeness" with the emphasis on the former. Absolute politeness is understood as universal and contains behavioral patterns that are recognized as polite in any human community. On the contrary, relative politeness is represented by a scale with positive and negative poles, on which certain speech acts are classified as "inherently polite" and "inherently impolite" (Leech, 1983, p. 83). Accordingly, G. Leech divides this phenomenon into negative politeness which "consists in minimizing the impoliteness of impolite illocutions" and positive politeness which "consists in maximizing the politeness of polite illocutions" (Leech, 1983, p. 83).

The researcher elaborates the theoretical foundations of the study of politeness by P. Grice and R. Lakoff and presents his own typology of maxims of politeness (Leech, 1983, p. 132), including:

1. Tact maxim: (a) Minimize cost to other; [(b) Maximize benefit to other]. Because any communication process involves personal spheres of both the speaker and the listener, it is necessary to respect the boundaries of the interlocutor's personal space and to exercise caution in choosing a speech strategy so as not to offend other people's interests.

2. Generosity maxim: (a) Minimize benefit to self; [(b) Maximize cost to self]. This maxim does not allow any of the interlocutors to dominate over another in the conversation.

3. Approbation maxim: (a) Minimize dispraise of other; [(b) Maximize praise of other]. Approbation Maxim requires people to avoid talking about whatever is unpleasant, especially when the subject is related to the hearer. The strategies of indirectness included in Politeness Principle, however, let speakers balance the unpleasant side of criticism.

4. Modesty maxim: (a) Minimize praise of self; [(b) Maximize dispraise of self]. Modesty Maxim which works closely with Approbation Maxim involves both self-dispraise and avoidance of other peoples dispraise.

5. Agreement maxim: (a) Minimize disagreement between self and other; [(b) Maximize agreement between self and other]. The Agreement Maxim seeks opportunities in which the speaker can "exaggerate agreement with other people, and mitigate disagreement by expressing regret, partial disagreement, etc." (Leech, 1983, p. 138).

6. Sympathy maxim: (a) Minimize antipathy between self and other; [(b) Maximize sympathy between self and other]. In the process of communication in any situation, the interlocutors should remain benevolent to each other, not allowing the emergence of conflict situations.

Leech proposes that each of these maxims should have a set of scales which must be consulted by the hearer in determining, for example, the degree of Tact or Generosity required in a given speech situation. The scales have been termed as the cost-benefit scale (represents the cost or benefit of an act to the speaker and hearer),

the optionality scale (represents the relevant illocutions, ordered by the amount of choice which the speaker permits the hearer), the indirectness scale (represents the relevant illocutions, ordered in terms of hearer's "work" to infer speaker's intention), the authority scale (represents the relative right for speaker to impose wishes on the hearer), and the social distance scale (represents the degree of familiarity between the speaker and the hearer) (Fraser, 1990, p. 232).

The first four maxims can be combined into two pairs because "they deal with bipolar scales: the cost-benefit and praise-dispraise scales" (Leech, 1983, p. 132). The last two maxims are not combined into a pair because they "deal with unipolar scales: the scales of agreement and sympathy" (Leech, 1983, p.132). According to G. Leech, not all maxims and submaxim are equally important. So, in paired maxims (1) - (4), the Tact maxim and the Generosity maxim have a greater acting force in speech behaviour than the Approbation maxim and the Modesty maxim. This reflects a general pattern: politeness is more focused on "others" than on "self". Moreover, within each maxim, the first submaxim is more important than the second one, which also indicates a general pattern that "negative politeness (avoidance of discord) is a more weighty consideration than positive politeness (seeking concord)". (Leech, 1983, p. 133).

Moreover, Leech notes that because of its force an utterance will require different kinds and degrees of politeness, and suggests that there should be four main illocutionary functions, according to "how they relate to the social goal of establishing and maintaining comity": competitive

(a) Competitive: The illocutionary goal competes with the social goal; e. g. ordering, asking, demanding, begging, etc.

(b) Convivial: The illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal; e. g. offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, congratulating.

(c) Collaborative: The illocutionary goal is different to the social goal; e. g. asserting, reporting, announcing, instructing.

(d) Conflictive: The illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal; e. g. threatening, accusing, cursing, reprimanding (Leech, 1983, p. 104).

According to V. De Walle (1993), and R. Watts (1992), G. Leech's conceptual positions are too theorized, inflexible, and far from linguistic reality. The disadvantage is also the limited number of maxims and the need to create new postulates in each individual speech act, as a result of which there is a risk of creating an infinite number of maxims. This view has been shared by several researchers, such as Brown & Levinson (1987), Eelen (2001), Fraser (1990), Thomas (1995), Turner (1996), and Watts (2003).

In general, the importance of the theoretical foundations of G. Leech is not in doubt and, at the present stage of development of linguistics, is used in the study of reception and the use of politeness strategies in different cultures.

As we can see, the postulates proposed by P. Grice, R. Lakoff and G. Leech are postulates of communication that represent the cooperative principle and constitute the essence of rational behaviour of interlocutors. However, in phatic communication, an important role is played not only by the rules governing the effective transfer of information, but also by the interpersonal or psychological factors also matter. This is what determines the development of communication strategies and tactics that regulate harmonious and conflict-free communication.

1.1.3. The face-saving view. Most linguistic studies of politeness are based on the socio-psychological concept of P. Brown and S. Levinson. Their work *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (1988) has been reprinted several times and has had a major impact on the subsequent development of understanding politeness in linguistics.

Brown and Levinson build their theory of linguistic politeness, also known as the "face-saving theory", on the concept of "face", borrowed from the socio psychological theory of the American sociologist Erving Goffman (1972), which suggests that "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contract" (p. 5). A "face"

is not a certain established category; this category is created in the process of interaction with other participants during direct (face-to-face) social interaction.

In communication, a person is driven by both the need to get approval from others and the need not to become completely dependent on them. Interlocutors strive to preserve both their face and the face of the other: without observing this condition, normal and conflict-free communication is impossible. Therefore, it is considered that the semantics of politeness has two main aspects – the so-called "positive" and "negative".

Developing Goffman's ideas, Brown and Levinson introduce the concepts of positive face and negative face and the corresponding concepts of positive politeness and negative politeness. Positive politeness uses an arsenal of all the techniques and methods adopted in a given speech culture to show a desire for establishing a good rapport with the interlocutor, indicating goodwill and friendly feelings: usually the speaker demonstrates that they take into account at least part of the claims of the addressee/listener. On the contrary, negative politeness is a system of means of maintaining the necessary distance, emphasizing the absence of pressure on the interlocutor, showing respect for his/her independence, personal autonomy, etc., i.e. recognition of the unequal status of members of a given social group. These systems are called two politeness strategies that have a different focus: the first is approach-based, the second is avoidance-based. Each of these types of politeness is a system of communicative strategies by which the main goals of polite communication are achieved.

The demonstration of solidarity and maintaining distance, according to Brown and Levinson, are the essence of polite behaviour, that is, you can be polite if you show the interlocutor your solidarity and at the same time maintain a certain distance, thus expressing your respect to him. At the same time, from their point of view, negative politeness plays a more important role than positive. They call negative politeness the core of polite behaviour, while positive politeness is less obvious and less significant.

Thus, even the most elementary manifestation of politeness is aimed at taking into account the needs of the positive or negative face of the interlocutor. In terms of this theory of politeness, a negative face is "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others", and a positive face is "the want of every member that his wants to be desirable to at least some others" (Brown & Levinson, 1988, p. 62).

Positive politeness, based on the concept of "solidarity", reduces the differences between participants in a communicative act related to their social status, expresses understanding of the addressee's desire to agree with the speaker, to unite with him, blocks such speech acts that express indifference to the opinion and feelings of the addressee. Negative politeness, based on the concept of "power", emphasizes the difference between participants in communication and serves to neutralize face-threatening acts, an encroachment on the freedom of action of the addressee.

As follows from the above, the contrast between positive and negative politeness can be related to the social status, and it takes into account social/personal distance. Positive politeness is communication among "friends", while negative politeness is communication among "strangers". Communication at a personal distance requires sincerity and allows a certain spontaneity in the manifestation of desires. Communication at a social distance requires formal observance of decency and restraint.

There also exists other terms denoting the above-mentioned types of politeness. Positive politeness is also called "solidarity politeness" (Scollon & Scollon, 1983), "community" (Tannen, 1981), "participation" (Scollon & Scollon, 2001), and "politeness of rapprochement" («вежливость сближения») (Larina, 2003). All these terms reveal the main function of positive politeness – the function of a good rapport with the partners of communication, their joint activities. Negative politeness is also denoted by the terms 'deference politeness' (Scollon & Scollon, 1983), 'independence' (Tannen, 1981; Scollon & Scollon, 2001), and 'the politeness of estrangement' («вежливость отдаления») (Larina, 2003). In this case,

respect for the personal autonomy of the interlocutors, non-intrusiveness, and compliance with formality, distance are emphasized.

Any utterance that represents a threat to another person's self-image is called a face-threatening act (FTA). Brown and Levinson make a first division between: a) acts that threaten negative face, and b) acts that threaten positive face (Brown & Levinson, 1988, p. 65).

The first group of FTAs threatening negative face includes all directive acts, which impede the freedom of interlocutor's actions: these are orders and requests, threats and warnings, etc. The same group includes suggestions and advice, offers, promises, which, although they suggest "benefits" for the addressee, nevertheless put some pressure on them to accept or reject these "benefits" from the speaker. Thus, these acts can be potentially interpreted as detrimental to the addressee's negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1988, pp. 65-66).

For the second group, the authors include, for example, the expressions of disapproval, criticism, contempt, ridicule, complaints, accusations, insult, and other acts, the performance of which indicates the speaker's negative evaluation of some aspects of the addressee's positive face. This group also includes FTAs that do not directly harm positive face, as the above-mentioned acts, but indirectly indicate the indifference of the speaker to the needs of the addressee's positive face. These are such actions as expression of violent emotions, mention of taboo topics, including those inappropriate in the context, bringing of bad news, boasting, demonstrating inattention to the interlocutor, disruptively interrupting the partner's speech, use of address terms and other status-marked identifications in initial encounters, etc. (Brown & Levinson, 1988, pp. 66-67).

The second in the classification of FTAs is the division into: a) acts that threaten the addressee's face and b) acts that threaten primarily the speaker's face. All actions described in the previous classification pose a threat to the addressee's face. The authors of the theory include the following acts that damage the speaker's positive face: apologies, admissions of guilt or responsibility, emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears, self-humiliation. The speaker's positive face is also

affected by statements containing the acceptance of a compliment or praise, in which, in accordance with the modesty maxim, the significance of the object for which a compliment was made is downplayed. The acts that damage the speaker's negative face include the following: acts the performance of which limit the speaker's freedom such as unwilling promises and offers, as well as expressing thanks, acceptance of the addressee's thanks or apology (ibid., pp. 66-67).

However, it should be noted that a clear classification of FTAs is not always possible. Thus, many acts pose a threat to both a positive and negative face (for example, interrupting the interlocutor's speech) and, on the other hand, a threat to both the addressee's face and the speaker's face (for example, a promise). Nevertheless, this classification allows a sufficiently detailed analysis of any FTA from the point of view of its role in regulating the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. So, polite behaviour, according to Brown and Levinson, implies the desire to maximally avoid committing FTA or, if FTA is inevitable, to do it in such a way that indicates clearly that such face threat is not desired. To achieve this allows the use of certain strategies for doing FTAs, which will be discussed in more detail in the next subchapter.

Despite the considerable prevalence of Brown and Levinson's concept of politeness, some aspects of their theory are criticized by modern researchers. One perspective of politeness that might be overlooked by Brown and Levinson's theory is discernment type of politeness proposed by Ide (1989). Ide (1989) identifies two types of politeness: volitional politeness and discernment politeness. The former is based on the speaker's intention and realized by their verbal strategies, while the latter rationally depends on the speaker's social norm or conventions, and as conveyed by these strategies. Speakers can express their intentions through volitional politeness to show to what extent they can be polite in certain situations. The rationale of volitional politeness is to save face in terms of using linguistic forms, such as, for instance, honorific expressions, since these linguistic forms can function as both encoders and conveyers of the speakers' intention and perception of a message involved in specific situations. Ide (1989) holds the view that Brown

and Levinson's theory puts less focus on the discernment politeness. She argues that such politeness relies heavily on the linguistic forms, such as "honorific principles", rather than the speaker's preference which is more relevant for instance in Japanese culture.

However, it is believed that Brown and Levinson's universal theory of politeness had the greatest influence on further research, through which linguists began to consider politeness as a fundamental aspect of socio-communicative interaction of people. As noted by Watts and Locher (2005), Brown and Levinson's "astute description of linguistic strategies is useful when analyzing linguistic interaction" (p. 9).

1.1.4. The conversational-contract view. In the most abstract, generalized form, politeness is represented in the works of Fraser and Nolen (1981, 1990), where it is studied as Conversational Contract. Although, their formulation of the theory of politeness and Brown and Levinson's one (1988) are based on Gricean maxims and Goffman's notion of "face", the former is slightly different from the latter. According to Fraser and Nolen, politeness is determined by the conditions and requirements of a specific communication agreement, a "conversational contract", where the interlocutors' rights and obligations are "negotiated", which they naturally must follow when conducting a dialogue. This suggests that the interlocutors, entering into a speech interaction and constructing a dialogue, determine the boundaries of communication, i.e. denote their "rights and obligations" which determine the scope of their interaction. And this, in turn, means that if nothing suggests otherwise, then one should expect the participants of the conversation to fulfill their obligations, which is one of the conventions of communication. And then everything that will be within the framework of this agreement, within the framework of the existing conversational contract, will be polite and that what is outside the accepted rules, will be defined as "impolite". And since there is always the opportunity to agree on new conditions for interaction, the interlocutors always have the opportunity to be polite in the process of interaction. Therefore, Fraser

considers "being polite constitutes operating within the current terms and conditions of the CC" (Fraser, 1990, p. 233).

According to him (Fraser, 1990, pp. 232-3), the conversational contract works within certain conditions or terms of dialogue: conventional, institutional, and situational. Some rights or obligations are imposed by conventions and traditions. Such conditions are of general nature and are not subject to situational negotiation. Speakers, for example, are expected to take turns, to use mutually intelligible language, to speak sufficiently loudly for the other to hear clearly and to speak seriously. Some conditions and terms are imposed by the institutional nature of interaction. For instance, speakers are expected to speak only in whisper during a Protestant church service; everyone is expected to address the U. S. Chief Executive as "Mr. President"; and a witness in court is expected to speak only when questioned. Finally, there are conditions that are activated in the light of the particular demands of a current situation. Such terms are open to negotiation according to the interlocutor's understanding "and/or acknowledgements of factors such as the status, the power, and the role of each speaker, and the nature of the circumstances'' (Fraser, 1990, p. 232). The third type of conditions, according to the authors, is more important, since it affects what types of speech acts are considered acceptable, appropriate for this type of social relationship (Fraser & Nolen, 1981, p. 94).

The outlined behaviour is normative rather than polite, against the background of which only violations of the cooperative principle are perceived. According to Fraser (1990), the participants of communication do not announce their intention to be polite, but in the process of communication they behave in accordance with the principles of cooperation (established norms), i. e. in accordance with the agreement. In this form, polite or impolite are not speech acts, but only the participants of communication and "only if their utterances reflect an adherence to the obligations they carry in that particular conversation" (p. 233). Although it is acknowledged that certain verbal choices such as *sir, I'm sorry, would you please*, etc. by virtue of their intrinsic meanings can convey about hearer's status, and these are characterized as deference. However, they are not intrinsically polite, but merely forms of status-

giving, whose politeness depends on how they abide by the terms of CC that are in effect at any specific moment. In their view no sentence is inherently polite or impolite.

From the above description of the category of politeness, it follows that this communicative category and the associated choice of linguistic means to express it in the communication process depend on a number of factors among which extralinguistic are of paramount importance. In this regard, it is advisable to consider this category in light of discourse.

1.2. Politeness strategies and their classification

The concept of strategy is not purely linguistic and, above all, is associated with the military sphere. In dictionary articles, the lexeme "strategy" is defined as "the skill of planning the movements of armies in a war, or an example of this". In a figurative sense, "strategy" acts as "a planned series of actions for achieving something".

Despite the attempts of scientists who are looking for a comprehensive understanding of the terminological unit of strategy, there is still an ambiguous definition of this concept. Discursive and pragmalinguistic approaches to the research of this problem are a priority in the given work. In the discursive approach, the concept of strategy is perceived as a tool for non-verbal goals in discursive meaningful activities, as "communicative intention of the speaker, formed on the basis of using social experience for their own individual needs and desires, and linguistic objectification of this intention, giving it interactive status through comprehension of verbalized intention by all interactants" (Flier, 2000, p. 112).

Within the linguopragmatic approach, the strategy is defined as "a set of language actions" (Trufanova, 2001, p. 58), as a way of organizing speech behavior in accordance with the plan, the intention of the communicant. We adhered to the view of the interactive nature of the strategy, which is considered as "the type of behaviour of one of the partners in the situation of dialogic communication, which

is conditioned and correlated with the plan to achieve global and local communicative goals within a typical scenario of functional-semantic representation of interactive type" (Romanov, 1995, p. 61).

Depending on the goals of communicative interaction from all the variety of strategies, interactants choose, as a rule, only some of their types and variants, aimed at improving social interaction, avoiding conflicts and maintaining harmonious relations. In other words, each communication strategy is characterized by a certain set of appropriate speech tactics, the implementation of which should achieve the communicative goal of communication.

In the linguistic literature, tactics are understood as a speech step that allows to achieve goals in a particular situation, while the choice of speech tactics differs in communicative situations of everyday or business communication. Unlike strategies, tactics are a specific speech move (step, turn, stage) in the process of implementing a speech strategy; speech action (speech act or a set of speech acts), which corresponds to a particular stage in the implementation of speech strategy and is aimed at solving a specific task of this stage. It is the implementation of the overall sequence of speech tactics that ensures the achievement of communicative goal of speech communication (specific interaction) (Skovorodnikov, 2004, p. 6).

In our study we agree with F. Batsevich (2005), who understands the strategy as the optimal realization of the speaker's intentions to achieve a specific goal of communication, i. e. control and selection of effective communication moves and their flexible modification in a particular situation (p. 121). By tactics we mean a line of behaviour at a certain stage of communicative interaction, aimed at obtaining the desired or preventing the effect of undesirable (Batsevich, 2005, p. 119).

The subject of serious theoretical reflection is the problem of classification of strategies. O. S. Issers's classification is based on the intentional-genre type of communicative action, while the main ones (semantic / cognitive) are singled out, which are the most significant at a certain stage of communicative interaction from the point of view of hierarchy of motives and goals and mainly related to its influence on the addressee, their world model, value system and behaviour, as well

as auxiliary strategies that contribute to the effective organization of dialogic interaction, optimal impact on the recipient and are defined by the researcher as pragmatic, rhetorical and dialogical (Issers, 2008, pp. 106-109).

G. G. Matveeva (2003) singles out regulatory strategies aimed at causing the desired changes in the broad extra communicative context of the situation, dictation strategies, the purpose of which is to inform the interlocutor about the facts of objective reality, the ability to think, tell, describe, logically discuss conversations and modal strategies that are focused on the expression of their feelings, evaluation, communicative intention, mood regarding speech and communicative situation (p. 123).

Relevant for the work is the classification of strategies proposed by T. van Djik, who identifies the global strategy of the entire discourse, the general strategy of the participant of speech interaction, which controls the results at local stages and is implemented through local strategies, the local strategy is a strategy to achieve more specific goals and the speech strategy is a functional unit of sequence of actions that contributes to the solution of a local or global problem (Djik, 1989, p. 274).

It should be noted that the classification of strategies of positive and negative politeness proposed by P. Brown and S. Levinson (1987) is generally accepted in linguistics. Positive politeness is represented by such strategies as:

1) Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods);
2) Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with H;
3) Intensify interest to H;
4) Use in-group identity markers;
5) Seek agreement;
6) Avoid disagreement;
7) Presuppose, raise, assert common ground;
8) Joke;
9) Assert, presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants;
10) Offer, promise;
11) Be optimistic;

12)   Include both S and H into activity;

13)   Give or ask for reasons;

14)   Assume or assert reciprocity;

15)   Give gifts to H: goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation (p. 102).

The strategies of positive politeness are distinguished by the following criteria: affirmation of the commonality of the addressor and the addressee, emphasizing the mutual interest of the speaker and the addressee and meeting the needs of the addressee. Positive politeness strategies in terms of asserting the commonality of the addressor and the addressee include strategies of paying attention to the addressee, exaggerating the friendly attitude to the addressee, increasing interest in the addressee, asserting group membership, seeking consent, avoiding disagreement, demonstrating commonality with the addressee, joking.

The basis of the mechanism for distinguishing the second group of strategies of positive politeness is the addressor's desire to convey the idea that they and the addressee are involved in joint activities. If the addressor and the addressee cooperate, they share common views in a particular area of activity, which serves as a sign of the strategy's focus on satisfying the "positive face" of the addressee. The main indicators of readiness and willingness to cooperate are the demonstration that:

a) the addressor wants what the addressee wants for himself;

b) the addressee wants what the addressor wants for himself;

c) the addressor focuses on their cooperation with the addressee, while their relationship should be dominated by reciprocity (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 115). This group includes strategies for caring about the needs of the addressee, suggestions and promises, assertion of optimism of the addresser in relations with the addressee, involvement of the addressee in joint activities, emphasizing the mutual interest of the addresser and the addressee, assumption or assertion of reciprocity.

As part of the last strategy of positive politeness "*Give gifts to H*", the addresser must show sympathy, understanding, love and admiration for the addressee and show care for them. The essence of the linguistic mechanism on which

this strategy is based is that the addresser tries to satisfy the positive face of the addressee by fulfilling some of his desires, in particular, to be heard, understood and approved.

Negative politeness strategies are aimed at "protecting the face" and include such strategies as:

1) Be conventionally indirect;

2) Question, hedge;

3) Be pessimistic;

4) Minimize the imposition;

5) Give deference;

6) Apologise;

7) Impersonalise Speaker and Hearer;

8) State the face threatening act as a general rule;

9) Nominalise;

10) Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting (Brown, & Levinson, 1987, p. 131).

Based on T. van Djik's classification of strategies and I. E. Frolova's strategy model, the paper proposes the following sequence of strategic-tactical implementation of politeness in English modern diological discourse: Global strategy > Local strategies > Tactics > Linguistic Means. A global strategy is considered to correspond to the addressor's general intention, aimed at rapprochement with the addressee (positive politeness) or distancing from the addressee (negative politeness). The global strategy is implemented through local strategies in dialogical discourse, which are analyzed in the next sub-chapter.

1.3. Implementation of politeness strategies in dialogical discourse

In recent years, a lot of research was conducted in the field of pragmatics and discourse analysis, which indicates a shift of interest from a language as a structure in isolation to a language in use that is discourse. If earlier the objects of research

were phonological, morphological and syntactic units, now the attention of linguists has been attracted by whole discourses. Speech is not realized through phonemes, morphemes or sentences, but discourses, therefore "the natural construction of linguistics as a science should start with the study of discourse and only with this level in mind investigate the smaller units obtained as a result of analytical procedures" (Kibrik, 2009, p. 3).

The term discourse functions in the conceptual framework of a number of sciences, such as linguistics, sociology, culturology, psychology, political science, etc. This concept is ambiguous in its interpretations in different areas of application, as it is the subject of interdisciplinary study. There is a large number of definitions that define this phenomenon from a variety of theoretical perspectives. V. S. Grigorieva (2007), for instance, distinguishes three main classes of the use of this term: "1) the linguistic proper, where discourse is thought of as speech, inscribed in a communicative situation, as a type of speech communication, as a unit of communication; 2) the discourse in journalism, dating back to the French structuralists and, above all, to M. Foucault; 3) discourse in formal linguistics, trying to introduce elements of discursive concepts into the arsenal of generative grammar" (p. 10).

In the first, properly linguistic meaning, the use of the term discourse is very diverse in itself, but on the whole, there are attempts to clarify and develop the traditional concepts of linguistic and speech units. The linguistic term discourse was first used in 1952 by the American scholar Z. Harris in his work *Discourse Analysis* that gave rise to modern study of discourse. According to Z. Harris (1952), discourse analysis is a method for the analysis of connected speech or writing, which is designed for "continuing discriptive linguistics beyond the limits of a single sentence at a time" and "correlating "culture" and language" (Harris, 1952, p. 1). The linguist understands discourse as "stretches of speech longer than one sentence" (Harris, 1952, p. 30).

It should be noted that from the very beginning the term discourse in the linguistic tradition meant speech in general and was synonymous with the term text;

the concepts denoted by these terms were considered identical. However, with the development of the theory of communication, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, the formation of the cognitive paradigm, the content of these concepts gradually acquired different meanings. A clear distinction between the concepts of discourse and text was introduced by the French school of discourse, which was founded in the 1960s. The anthropocentric paradigm of language, proposed by E. Benveniste (1974) in the second half of the 20th century, allowed to consider the discourse as "functioning of language in live communication" (p. 296). The researcher wrote that the utterance is "individual transformation of language in discourse", which forms the "utterance, and not the text of the utterance" (Benveniste, 1974, p. 297). Thus, a distinction was made between the process of realization of the language system – discourse and the result of this process – the text. Thus, these two authoritative scientists establish the tradition of the identical designation of different objects of research. Benveniste understands by discourse the explication of the speaker's position in a statement; in Harris's interpretation, the object of analysis is a sequence of statements, a piece of text larger than a sentence.

In recent years, when the development of communicative linguistics has shown the need to synthesize ideas developed in linguistics, sociology, psychology, ethnography, philosophy, cultural studies, the term "discourse" has gone beyond the linguistics of the text. The real practice of modern discourse analysis is associated with the study of the patterns of information movement within the framework of a communicative situation, carried out through the exchange of utterances; thus, the speech interaction between the addresser and the addressee is investigated, and not an individual's utterance. The discourse here is "a text combined with extralinguistic, pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors" (Arutyunova, 1988, p. 136).

In connection with a whole range of discursive approaches, T. A. van Dijk (1998) proposes to distinguish two definitions of discourse. In a broad sense, it is a complex communicative event that takes place between the speaker and the listener (interlocutor), in a certain temporal, spatial and other contexts. Communicative

action can be written or verbal and it can also have verbal and nonverbal components. In a narrow sense, discourse is an oral or written text, considering the presence of only one verbal component. Thus, discourse denotes a completed or long-term "product" of communicative action, its written or oral result, which is interpreted by recipients (1998). According to the concept proposed by T. A. van Dijk, consideration of the principles of language functioning in society is not only in terms of pragmatic approaches to discourse, but also taking into account certain social factors (views and attitudes of speakers, their social and ethnic status, etc.); in a certain way the personal characteristics of native speakers with their intentions, feelings, emotions are accentuated.

Like T. A. van Dijk, G. G. Pocheptsov (1999) considers discourse not purely as a linguistic structure, but as a sociolinguistic one. The researcher believes that it must meet the norms required by the linguistic, communicative and social situation. According to the sociological approach, attention is paid to the phenomena of linguistic variability due to such social factors as class, gender, and ethnic type. The sociological approach involves the study of discourse in terms of the peculiarities of its perception by certain classes of society, representatives of professional groups and ethnic groups. The variability of language and its functioning in real life led to the study of different social types of discourse. Thus, the discourse embodies the space of social interaction mediated by the means of a particular language. It is generated and formalized on the basis of the dynamic interaction of categories at different levels – conceptual, pragmatic, semantic, grammatical, etc.

The second class of uses of the term discourse, which in recent years has gone beyond the framework of science and has become popular in journalism, goes back to the French structuralists and poststructuralists, and above all to M. Foucault. Behind the use of the term "discourse" there is a tendency to clarify the traditional concepts of style and individual language. Understood in this way, the term "discourse" describes a way of speaking and necessarily has a definition of which or whose discourse. In this case, researchers are not interested in discourse in general, but in its specific varieties, purely linguistic distinctive features, stylistic

specificity. Moreover, it is assumed that the way of speaking largely predetermines and creates the very subject sphere of discourse, as well as the corresponding social institutions.

Due to the complexity of formalization of discursive processes, "discourse" in the third class of its uses is not the central object of formal linguistics. However, some linguists try to use discursive concepts in the arsenal of generative grammar.

In our work, the term "discourse" is used in the linguistic meaning and following F. S. Batsevich (2004), is considered as a type of communicative activity, an interactive phenomenon, a speech flow that has different forms of expression (oral, written, paralingual), occurs within a specific channel of communication, is regulated by the strategies and tactics of the participants; synthesis of cognitive, linguistic and extralinguistic (social, mental, psychological, etc.) factors that are determined by a specific range of life forms; dependent on the subject of communication, the result of which is the formation of various speech genres (p. 138).

Thus, the analysis of the definitions of discourse proposed by leading scholars allows us to state that its relevant features are considered by most linguists to be textual essence in combination with extralingual factors. Accordingly, we consider dialogic discourse as a product of joint communicative activity of two or more individuals, which includes in addition to the actual speech representation a certain set of extralingual features (communicative guidance of participants in speech interaction, the presence of general background knowledge, common theme, etc.).

The specificity of the dialogue and the complexity of its structure are due to the interaction of a number of factors that must be taken into account in the study. In this regard, one of the current problems in linguistic pragmatics is the construction of a typology of dialogical discourses. G. I. Bubnova (1987) defines four classes of dialogues in accordance with the content of dialogue topics and the dynamics of language exchange of information, namely: neutral dialogue (conversation with distance between partners), dialogue-unison (with personal topics), dialogue-

discussion (with neutral-abstract topics) and dialogue about events (with personal topics, which emotionally experienced by partners) (p. 50).

From the point of view of sociolinguistics, there are two main types of discourse: personal (personality-oriented) and institutional. According to V. I. Karasik (2002), in the first case, "participants of communication strive to reveal their inner world to the addressee and understand the addressee as a person in all the variety of personal characteristics, in the second case, the communicants act as representatives of a particular social group, perform the role prescribed by the communicative situation" (p. 305).

Institutional discourse is based on communication between the agent and the client, who are the main participants in the discourse; the scientist understands an agent as a representative of an institute, and a client as a person who addresses an agent. Thus, the following pairs of "agent-client" for different types of institutional discourse can be named: "teacher and student, doctor and patient, politician and voter, priest and parishioner" (Karasik, 2002, p. 307). The following types of institutional discourse are distinguished on the basis of goals and participants in communication: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, religious, mystical, medical, business, advertising, sports, scientific, theatrical and mass media (Karasik, 2000, p. 307). At the same time, he notes that the specified list can be changed or supplemented due to the heterogeneity of social institutions, their different nature.

Personal discourse is identified as everyday and existential communication in the research of colloquial speech and is defined as "a natural initial type of discourse, organically assimilated from childhood" (Karasik, 2000, p. 5). Such communication takes place between people who know each other well, and its task is to maintain contact and solve everyday problems. Non-verbal components including facial expressions and gestures play an important role in such communication. In this case, verbal communication may sometimes complement non-verbal communication. Participants in communication say the main points spontaneously, often violating the logic and structural design of the statement, pronouncing them fluently and

indistinctly. The lexical fund of such statements is characterized by the presence of reduced slang vocabulary. As for existential discourse, it is intended for finding and experiencing essential meanings, here we are not talking about obvious things, but about the artistic and philosophical comprehension of the world.

The least structured type can rightfully be considered the discourse of everyday communication, presented in the form of oral conversation. V. Kashkin defines it as "the discourse of the sphere of everyday communication" (Kashkin, 2000, p. 21). This discourse, in turn, can be divided into subtypes: adolescent discourse, discourse of companionship, discourse of marital relations, etc. The family discourse, produced by family members, close and distant relatives, seems to be more extensive and meaningful. At the same time, the emphasis is placed on the closeness of relationships, regulated autonomously within each individual family.

The choice of politeness strategies and tactics depends on the role of the addresser (status-role and situational-communicative characteristics) as well as conditions of communication (presuppositions, sphere of communication, chronotope) (Karasik, 1992, p. 241). Choosing politeness strategies in the dialogical discourse, certain social, psychological characteristic of the addresser should be taken into account. The behaviour of the participants of the dialogue depends on the status and position in society and in interpersonal relations (Orban-Lembrick, 2010, p. 153). In particular, the status-role communicative characteristics of the addresser are defined as the social status of the interlocutor, which depends on the socio-situational relationships of the addresser with the addressee and the assessment of their speech (Karasik, 1992, p. 243).

The status-role behaviour of the addresser is a socially conditioned and socially significant characteristic of the participant of dialogic communication. From the linguistic point of view, the communicative role of the addresser acts as a relatively stable, internally connected and expected by the addressee system of communicative actions of the addresser, which largely depends on their social status, age, gender and other factors (Batsevich, 2004, p. 109).

The social status of the addresser can be higher, lower, or coincide with the social status of the addressee. Accordingly, if the social status of the addresser is higher than the social status of the addressee, then the statements of the latter are characterized by the formality of speech, because the communicative situation usually occurs in a business atmosphere. If the social status of the addresser coincides with the social status of the addressee, it is a dialogue between people related by family, friendships, partnerships, and the addresser's statements are often implemented in a wide range of possible communication situations using various politeness strategies. When the social status of the addresser is lower than the social status of the addressee, the statements of the latter may be marked by indulgence or arrogance, depending on the chosen politeness strategies. Therefore, the addresser is the bearer of different status and role characteristics that determine the choice of politeness strategies and tactics.

Politeness strategies and tactics in dialogic discourse depend on the situational and communicative characteristics of the addresser. The communicative circumstances in which the addresser finds themselves are a meaningful component of the dialogic discourse. Changing the conditions of communication leads to a change in the parameters of discourse, because the communicative situation is a complex and ambiguous phenomenon. On the one hand, it is always specific and unique, and on the other hand, it acts as a variant of a certain type of communicative situations (Karasik, 1994, p. 2-7). Therefore, the addressor uses various politeness strategies and tactics that take into account socially, psychologically and culturally significant conditions and circumstances of dialogical communication.

Communication conditions affect the course of dialogical interaction, in particular, the addresser's choice of politeness strategies and tactics. Among such conditions are the sphere of communication, chronotope and communicative environment. As has been stated earlier, matrimonial discourse belongs to everyday dialogic communication, which includes situations of interpersonal interaction in the conditions of everyday communication in the family, everyday life, at work. The main task of polite strategies and tactics in the domestic sphere is to serve as a means

of daily communication, exchange of views, solving daily problems with the addressee.

Among the factors influencing the course of dialogical speech and determine the addressor's choice of politeness strategies and tactics is the chronotope, i. e. the unity of temporal and spatial parameters of dialogical communication, which takes place at a certain time in a certain place, aimed at achieving the communicative goals of the addressor. Depending on the chronotope, dialogical communication between the addressor and the addressee can be direct, i. e. "face to face", occur simultaneously and side by side, or indirectly – simultaneously, but at a distance, for example, by telephone. Therefore, the chronotope is a mandatory component of dialogical discourse, which affects the nature of politeness.

Conclusions to Chapter One

For a long time, the subject of academic interest continues to be the success of the communicative aspect of social interaction and psychological processes that occur in the process of effective communication. In any system of constructive communication, language is not the only possible and most effective means of intercultural interaction, but it is in the speech of individuals that the most powerful constructs of the language code are reflected, in particular, politeness.

In Chapter One of the Master's thesis, approaches to the interpretation of the term "politeness" were considered both in the works of scholars who were at the origins of the study of this phenomenon, and in modern pragmalinguistics. The rapid growth of scientific interest in the study of the category of politeness, one of the key components of constructive communication, characterizes the direction of development of scientific thought in recent decades. This process indicates the urgent need to study the category of politeness in terms of intercultural interaction of speakers, which will have positive results in highlighting similarities and differences in communicative behaviour of representatives of different cultural codes.

In modern scientific research, politeness is presented as a social norm, maxims of communication, and a conversational contract. However, the vast majority of researchers in recent decades have studied the phenomenon of politeness as a system of strategies used in communication. This understanding of politeness was proposed by P. Brown and S. Levinson, who represent the latter in the context of the concept "face" and strategies of positive and negative politeness aimed at its protection and preservation.

Considering the terms "negative" and "positive politeness" emotionally marked, we have used the notions "politeness of distancing" and "politeness of rapprochement" or "politeness of contact" in our work. Realization of politeness of rapprochement is analyzed in our study based on the example of matrimonial dialogical discourse represented in the TV series *This Is Us*.

CHAPTER TWO
VERBALIZATION OF POSITIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN MATRIMONIAL DISCOURSE

2.1. Linguistic means implementing global positive politeness strategy

The central element in everyday discourse is communication in the family, the main types of which are matrimonial dialogic discourse (communication "husband – wife"), parental dialogic discourse (communication "parents – children"), and discourse of siblings (communication "brothers – sisters"). These types of discourse, given the social sphere and the position of the participants in communication, act as varieties of personality-oriented discourse in the family sphere. The primary focus of this research is on matrimonial dialogic discourse, that is the conversation between husband and wife. The conversations of three married couples (Jack and Rebecca Pearson, their adult son Randall and Beth Pearson and their adult daughter Kate and Toby Damon) from the TV series *This Is Us* were analyzed.

Strategies of positive politeness are manifested in the demonstration of attention and interest in the interlocutor, the desire for mutual understanding and agreement with them, taking into account their desires and inclinations. The speaker chooses a positive strategy when trying to be closer to the listener, wants to show attention to him/her. To do this, the addressor uses emotionally-colored words, expresses compliments and more. Positive politeness is based on the rapprochement of distance between the participants of communication, as a result of which their chosen communication strategy is associated with the demonstration of mutual ability and solidarity, respect and interest, desire for harmony and mutual understanding, taking into account desires and preferences, the result of which is to indicate the interlocutors' desire to improve the positive face (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 102).

Positive politeness as a global strategy in the communicative-interactional aspect is represented in the matrimonial discourse by local strategies aimed at rapprochement with the addressee, among which the most important one is the local strategy for the addressor's claiming '*common ground'* with the addressee. This local strategy is further subdivided into three strategies that help to indicate that the addressor and the addressee both belong to the same group of people who share specific wants: the addressor may convey that the addressee's want is admirable or interesting to them too; or they may claim in-group membership with the addressee; finally, the addressor can claim common perspective with the addressee without necessarily referring to in-group membership.

2.2. Strategies for conveying that the addressee's want is admirable, interesting to the addressor

The first strategy, that is the local strategy for conveying that the addressee's want is admirable, interesting to the addressor is reflected in respect for certain aspects of the addressee's personality and is implemented through tactics of complementary interaction (*Notice, attend to the addressee (their interests, wants, needs, goods*), fascination (*Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with the addressee*) and intimacy of the narrative (*Intensify interest to the addressee*).

In the family discourse of TV series *This Is Us*, the tactics "*Notice, attend to the addressee (their interests, wants, needs, goods)*" is implemented through the use of ritualized forms of behavioral complex (Larina, 2009, p. 280), while the lexical means of its implementation are phrases of gratitude.

Example:

(1) Toby: *"Thanks again for agreeing to come. They really wanted to meet my wife"* Kate: *"Of course"* (Herbert & Fletcher, 2019, 8:16).

P. Hobbes emphasizes that the phrase *thank you* is a formal marker rather than an expression of sincere gratitude (Hobbs, 2003, p. 259). In most cases, the members of the Pearson's family show their thankfulness not for help, but for showing

interest, attention to them as well as understanding and acceptance of their needs or wishes:

(2) Toby: *"You been watching this for a while? You wanna take a little breather?"* Kate: *"This is what I do on Super Bowl Sunday, Tobe. It's cathartic for me, and it's the anniversary. Okay? So, I'm going for the catharsis jugular"* Toby: *"Okay. Just... I will let you... cathart"* Kate: *"Thank you"* (Fogelman, Requa & Ficarra, 2018, 8:57);

(3) Beth: *"Maybe some wine will help that"* Kevin: *"Probably. Yeah"* Beth: *"Yup. All right"* Kevin: *"Thank you"* (Todd & Hunt, 2016, 33:45).

However, there are instances in the family discourse when the close relatives use *thank you* exactly for the given help. For instance, saying "Thank you. That's very kind", Randall's biological father William wants to express his understanding and gratefulness for his son's efforts to make a quick appointment with the experienced doctor:

(4) Randall: *"I got you an appointment with an immunotherapy specialist"* William: *"Oh, that's not necessary"* Randall: *"No, it was nothing. Guy at my firm had an in. This guy is doing some really ground-breaking stuff"* William: *"Thank you; that's very kind"* Randall: *"You got it"* (Fogelman & Olin, 2016, 6:49).

Usually the family members begin their conversation with the exchange of greetings such as "*Hi*", "*Hey*", "*Good morning*", etc.:

(5) Rebecca: *"Hi"* Kevin: *"Hey, I was just calling to check on you"* (Fogelman, Requa & Ficarra, 2018, 38:21);

(6) Toby: *"Hi. Hey, there's my maybe-mama"* Kate: *"Morning maybe-daddy"* (Steinberg & Koch, 2018, 8:19).

Linguistic rituals are diverse in family discourse of the TV series "*This Is Us*". Not only husband and wife use the expression "*I love you*" to say good-bye (7) but also the parents and their children (8):

(7) Randall: *"Beth, I got a whole other family down here. You got to see it"* Beth: *"Well, take lots of video"* Randall: *"I will. I love you, Beth"* Beth: *"I love you"* (Fogelman, Requa & Ficarra, 2017, 32:14);

(8) Rebecca: *"See you later"* Randall: *"Okay."* Rebecca: *"Hey, drive safe. I love you"* Randall: *"Love you, too, Mom"* (Tilghman & Olin, 2017, 11:01).

Using the tactics "*Notice, attend to the addressee (their interests, wants, needs, goods)*", the interlocuters also focus on the particular features of the members of the family by applying the tactics of compliment. A compliment as an expression approving a certain virtue of a person contains a positive assessment of the skills, qualities or character traits of the interlocutor, creates a high emotional state in the listener, shows a hidden desire to improve the mood of the recipient and enlist his support.

According to J. Holmes (1988), a compliment is "a speech act that explicitly or implicitly expresses approval to someone other than the speaker, usually the addressee for any virtue (property, quality, ability), which is positively assessed by the speaker and the addressee" (p. 465). So, a complementary statement contains a positive assessment of the addressee, his personal qualities, professional success, etc.

A principal feature of the illocutionary power of a compliment is that its obligatory components are additional illocutionary goals: a) to express a positive intentional state, the representative content of which is a positive evaluative judgment; b) to express intention / desire to give pleasure to the addressee; c) to express a positive attitude to the addressee (Kolod'ko, 2014, p. 86).

Compliment can be compared with praise. At first glance, compliment and praise are similar, because they are united by a common goal – the desire of the addressor to positively evaluate the addressee. However, there is a feature that, according to V. Mishchenko (1997), differentiates compliment and praise. It is the direct connection of the object of positive evaluation with the addressee (p. 108): a compliment is paid to a person present in a communication situation, as opposed to praise aimed at assessing certain actions of a "third party".

It should be noted that studying the family discourse of the TV series *This Is Us*, we have noticed that the family members used to praise people who were not present during the conversation.

(9) Kate: *"Wasn't he great? I mean, I've always told Kevin he was great, but this is beyond what he's ever done. And to see him up there, not just pursuing his passion, but freaking crushing it? He was so inspiring"* Toby: *"He was awesome"* (Steinberg, Herbert, & Stanzler, 2017, 40:06).

The following examples of discursive episodes also serve as an illustrative material for the approving remarks to a person who did not participate in the conversation, but was presented in the stories of the interlocutors:

(10) Jack: *"God, wasn't Randall so cute?"* Rebecca: *"He's still cute"* Jack: *"Yeah, he's fine. He was cuter when he was five"* (Lawson, Brunstetter, & Koch, 2017, 9:44);

(11) Rebecca: *"How can they not like Randall?"* Jack: *"I don't know, he's the best"* Rebecca: *"He's so sweet and smart and he's funny. Like, actually funny"* Jack: *"I know! Not just little kid funny"* (Lawson, Brunstetter, & Koch, 2017, 16:15);

(12) Beth: *"You excited about this weekend? I can't wait for you to meet my cousin Zoe. She's gonna take Kate and Toby's wedding photos. Yeah, she's the cool one. In my family, she's the cool one"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2018, 4:10);

(13) Randall: *"My dad was a superhero. Man literally saved my life the day I was born. And he always took action. He never sat still. He was a superhero and then he died and we've all been scrambling ever since... ...scrambling to keep him alive however we can... ...scrambling for new ways to feel close to him. I pride myself on having a piece of my dad in me, always have"* (Brownell, & Asher, 2018, 37:48);

(14) Randall: *"I won the lottery, baby. Oh, that's what Deja called it. Me landing you"* Beth: *"Smart kid"* Randall: *"Yeah, she is"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2019, 35:49).

Complementarity is characterized by polyfunctionality. A compliment is used to improve relationships and maintain contacts, but the most important thing is to influence the emotional state of the listener. Thus, the tactics of complimenting helps create an atmosphere of friendliness during the conversation.

We identified a group of compliments to the nature of the interlocutors, their traits and features that are manifested in personal contacts:

(15) Rebecca: *"You're a genius"* (Johnson, Windsor, & Ventimiglia, 2019, 19:26);

(16) Rebecca: *"My hero"* Jack: *"Yeah. I just put them to bed one night"* Rebecca: *"You're the real hero"* (Kenar & Hartley, 2020, 42:11);

(17) Rebecca: *"You are a miracle. You know that, Jack? Coming from your dad and being the dad that you are, you are a freaking miracle"* Jack: *"Yeah, well, takes one to know one, Bec"* Rebecca: *"I love you"* Jack: *"I love you, too. Bye"* (Bensinger, Requa, & Ficarra, 2017, 29:54);

(18) Jack: *"Yeah. I don't need anniversaries to see you. I see you every day. You are my daily meteor shower"* Rebecca: *"Ah, babe"* Jack: *"Thank you for marrying me"* Rebecca: *"Mm. Thank you for asking me"* (Oyegun & Asher, 2018, 37:11);

(19) Beth: *"You hear me?"* Randall: *"Do I hear you? You're my favorite sound in the world. Of course, I hear you"* Beth: *"Don't be soft, man. Come on. City taxes and statistics"* Randall: *"Yes, ma'am"* (Tilghman, & Olin, 2018, 7:37);

(20) Beth: *"Husband"* Randall: *"Hmm?"* Beth: *"You are a man... who cares too much and tries too hard. It's who you've always been. It's who I married. A great man. I will not let you forget who you are. I should've had your back. You need to finish this campaign"* (Kenar & Dawson, 2019, 28:24);

(21) Randall: *"Beth Clarke...you are the love of my life. You are my reason. You are my joy. You are my everything. And I don't want to do life without you, so... will you marry me?"* Beth: *"I don't want to do life without you, either. Yes. Yes. (WHISPERS): Yes!"* (Oyegun & Hooks, 2019, 18:16).

Thus, the strategy "*Notice, attend to the addressee (their interests, wants, needs, goods)*" is implemented in the matrimonial discourse by using ritualized forms of behavioral complexes and compliments helping create a pleasant atmosphere. Nouns, adjectives, adverbs and comparisons are the means of speech used to express this strategy in conversations between close relatives.

The next strategy, which is aimed at getting closer to the interlocutor, is the strategy "*Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with the addressee*". Its main

purpose is to affirm the commonality, unity and solidarity of the speaker and the listener by demonstrating an exaggerated friendly attitude towards the latter. Exaggeration is one of the most important features of the English communicative behavior. At first glance, the strategies *"Notice, attend to the addressee (their interests, wants, needs, goods)"* and *"Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with the addressee"* look similar. However, their difference is that in the first strategy the speaker states the facts, and in the second – he/she shows his/her emotional attitude to the stated facts. Such emotionality transmits to the interlocutor the positive intentions of the speaker and helps them gain the support of the listener.

It should be noted that in the matrimonial discourse, the strategy of exaggeration is one of the leading and is also based on the compliment tactics used in the strategy *"Notice, attend to the addressee (their interests, wants, needs, goods)"*. However, in the context of the strategy *"Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with the addressee"*, it reflects the increased interest in the interlocutor and is realized, first of all, with the help of emotionally colored adjectives. The main attention is paid to the appearance of guests, their age, mood, etc. Linguistic means that implement the strategy of exaggeration of attention to the recipient are quite numerous, in particular, they include emotionally colored adjectives such as *fantastic, brilliant, gorgeous, beautiful, amazing, great, impressive*, etc.

Quite often the compliment is built on the basis of the comparative and superlative degrees of a qualitative adjective. This tool reflects the scale of complementarity tactics and allows the recipient to feel his/her significance:

(22) Rebecca: *"This is the best first anniversary ever"* (Kenar & Kerns, 2018, 1:11);

(23) Jack: *"Bec. Sorry to have to wake you up to ask, but…"* Rebecca: *"Hmm?"* Jack: *"You are the most beautiful sick lady - I have ever seen"* (Bauman & Hooks, 2020, 17:10);

(24) Rebecca: *"Baby, you are the strongest person I know"* Jack: *"I don't know"* Rebecca: *"But I do. I know. I know. I know. Okay"* (Aptaker, Berger, Requa, & Ficarra, 2017, 27:58);

(25) Rebecca: "*And, the thing is, I feel like I'm there, Jack. I feel like I'm operating at a nine. Because I do individualized lunches and I do individualized tuck-ins for each kid so nobody feels gypped. And... (scoffs) When you're home, and you're you, you're <u>way better than I am. You're a ten</u> when you're you, Jack*" (Fogelman & Olin, 2017, 20:16);

(26) Jack: "*You asked me a question before. What is it that I love about you now. - Jack... So I'm gonna start with the obvious. I love the mother that you are. I love that you are still <u>the most beautiful</u> woman in any room and that you laugh with your entire face. I love that you dance funny... (chuckles) and not sexy, which... makes it <u>even sexier.</u> But most of all, I love that you are still the same woman who, all those years ago, ran out of a blind date because she simply had to sing. (chuckles) You're not just my great love story, Rebecca. You... You were my big break*" (Fogelman, Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2017, 39:54);

(27) Randall: "*Look, I know it'll be tight, but I really think you could make it. I wouldn't ask if it wasn't important, Beth. Duncan assigns the new councilmen to their committees. It's important that I make a good impression on him. And I... You tend to be <u>the most impressive</u> part of the impressions that I make. But if it's too much, I understand*" Beth: "*No. No. I'll be there*" Randall: "*Really?*" Beth: "*Yeah*" (Herbert & Tillman Jr., 2019, 16:49);

(28) Kate: "*You are <u>the sweetest</u> man in the whole world*" Toby: "*I'll take it*" (Oyegun & Tillman Jr., 2017, 13:06);

(29) Kate: "*I know I cut it short before, but I think it's <u>one of your all-time sweetest, most romantic</u> gestures*" Toby: "*Actually, it's number one. You just haven't seen the rest of it*" (Falls, Gomez, & Boyd, 2020, 29:34).

The use of the intensifying adverbs is another characteristic feature of the communication style in the family discourse. To make their remarks more expressive, husband and wife use various intensifiers in order to give the usual compliment a shade of exaggeration. The most commonly used intensifying markers include such adverbs as *very, so, really, quite, hugely, extremely, terribly, pretty, absolutely*, and others.

It should be noted that the intensifier *very* is usually used in short emotional expressions that characterize the guest, the results of his/her work and etc. For example:

(30) Jack: *"So, always thought that, when my folks die, we get to do our own thing, you know? Make up our own stupid traditions with the kids"* Rebecca: *"That's because you're <u>a very, very naive</u> man"* Jack: *"Yeah? Thank you"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Anderson, 2016, 2:47);

(31) Jack: *"You know, being here doesn't make me sad. In fact, if anything, it makes me amazed. The kids, they have such a normal upbringing, and that's because of you. I mean, I don't have any of this in my back pocket. You know, n-no good childhood memories to go off of, so I'm just kind of making things up as I go along. But you... you do all this so well. It's all <u>so effortless</u>"* (Herbert & Tillman Jr., 2019, 38:27).

Another intensifier – *really* – is mainly used during emotional storytelling, for example:

(32) Jack: *"Is it stupid? 'Cause in my mind, when I was doing it was <u>really romantic</u>. Rebecca, th-this is the most romantic gift ever"* (Kenar & Kerns, 2018, 1:38);

(33) Jack: *"Okay, look, hey, hey. What if a third set of hands is actually gonna be helpful with the kids?"* Rebecca (laughs): *"You're <u>really cute</u> when you're dumb"* Jack: *"Yeah?"* (Herbert & Olin, 2017, 11:01);

(34) Jack: "*Hey, you know what? I'm <u>really, really excited</u> about your show tonight"* Rebecca: *"You are?"* Jack: "*Yeah. <u>Really excited</u>. Hmm. But don't get too tired from all the singing, okay? 'Cause I still want to take you out to O'Shannon's for dinner"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2017, 1:45)

(35) Jack: *"I never got batteries, for the smoke detectors. That... you asked me three times, and I just... I forgot"* Rebecca: *"And I was more than capable of getting those batteries myself"* Jack: *"Okay, so then, why'd you keep asking me?"* Rebecca: *"How could you possibly joke right now?"* Jack: *"Well, it's because I still*

got *the only thing that I've ever really needed"* Rebecca: *"You are good"* Jack: *"I try"* (Fogelman, Requa, & Ficarra, 2018, 17:54).

Another means of implementing an exaggeration strategy is a comparative construction with *like*:

(36) Randall: *"Beth, I'm trying to..."* Beth: *"Close your eyes. I want you to see yourself going out there and killing it. You are prepared, you're wearing the hell out of that suit and you were born to do this. Whatever they throw at you, I want you to return it. Like Serena. You are fierce, dignified and in top form. Can you see it?"* Randall: *"I'm mostly just seeing Serena Williams in that catsuit, but yes... no, thank you. I can see it"* Beth: *"Good"* (Tilghman & Olin, 2018, 10:57);

(37) Randall: *"Hey. Just saw the new windows going in over at the community center. Yeah. Got some real nice double-paned beauties. Almost as beautiful as my wife"* Beth: *"Did you just compare me to rec center windows?"* Randall: *"They're double-paned windows. It's the sexiest kind of windows"* Beth: *"Okay. All right"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Koch, 2019, 5:09);

(38) Kate: *"You actually look like a young Bruce Willis"* Toby: *"Don't do that. You cannot tell a man who went bald at that he looks like a young Bruce Willis. - It's too much"* (Fogelman & Olin, 2017, 9:33);

(39) Toby: *"Oh, damn, girl. You look like you're in a Whitesnake video. Yeah, you make IVF look very rock and roll"* (Oyegun & Koch, 2018, 8:39);

(40) Kate: *"I'm so happy that you're getting healthy, and you look amazing. Seriously, you look like Vin Diesel's body double"* Toby: *"You know that The Pacifier's my guilty pleasure"* Kate: *"Yes. All too well"* (Herbert & Fletcher, 2019, 31:40).

The dominant group of linguistic means used in TV series *This Is Us* is emotionally colored adjectives. It can be explained by the fact that the vast majority of them are clichéd and standard. In most cases, these are exclamations of admiration, which quite successfully implement the strategy of exaggeration in the family discourse. Then are adverbs intensifiers, comparative constructions with *like*, qualitative adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees, repetitions of

words are used. These means describe certain qualities of the interlocutors, reveal their similarities with other individuals, which helps increase the self-esteem of the invited stars and increase the level of sympathy.

Another way of reinforcing *"common ground"* between the interlocuters is intensifying the addressor's interest in the addressee in their own narratives. This can be achieved with the help of a discourse marker "*you know*" that "enlists the hearer not just as an information recipient, but as a particular kind of participant to the storytelling (an audience)" (Schiffrin, 1988, p. 281).

(41) Jack: "*You know, when I was a little boy, I didn't know what I wanted to be when I grew up. Adults always ask little kids that. You know? I never had a good answer. Not until... not until I was 28. Till the day that I met you. That's when I knew exactly what I wanted to be when I grew up: I wanted to be the man that made you happy*" Rebecca: "*You make me happy*" Jack: "*Not always. Not lately*" (Fogelman & Olin, 2016, 38:37).

In this example, the second "*you know*" has also additional function, that is to present the general truth (adults ask little children about what they want to be when they grow up) which Jack assumes Rebecca shares through their co-membership in the same society.

Apart from narratives, this discourse marker also functions both informationally and interactionally in arguments, in which it appeals to the interlocutors' shared knowledge as a way of getting an opponent around to your own way of thinking, as is presented in the next example:

(42) Randall: "*Just think about it, Beth. There's this whole genetic side of me that nobody even knew existed. I mean, William was a poet, an artist, a musician. You know, maybe I've had an artistic side in me all along and nobody knew to empower it. You know, maybe I wasn't meant to be a straight and narrow math geek destined to wear a shirt and tie every day like my parents thought. Maybe I was meant to live a musician's life. On the road and playing clubs, you know?*" Beth: "*All right, well, in this musical fantasy version of yourself, what instrument would*

you...” Randall: “*Sax. Mm. Like Wesley in Mo' Better Blues. Definitely sax*” (Brunstetter & Zisk, 2016, 12:00).

The use of direct speech – a mode of reporting what someone has said, in which we reproduce the actual words spoken or written (Leech, 2006, p. 34) – rather than reported speech is one of the widespread tactics to intensify the addressor's genuine interest to the addressee by sharing their intimate thoughts with them.

(43) Rebecca: “*And even when I watch Tom Hanks, I sit there and I think to myself, 'He's not so great' And who does that? Who watches Tom Hanks and thinks, 'You know what? I'm married to a man that's better than that'*” (Fogelman & Olin, 2017, 37:23).

After a heated argument with her husband Jack and their joint decision to live apart for a while, Rebecca visits Jack in his friend's house, where he currently lives, to ask him to come back to her. The quotation of her own thoughts, in which she compares her husband with the acclaimed movie star Tom Hanks, helps her express her strong feelings to Jack and reinforce her request.

In the next example, Toby also resorts to directly quoted speech to open up his mind to Kate and literally show his thought for her.

(44) Toby: “*When I woke up this morning, I forgot for a split second. I was just looking at you and thinking, 'Wow. She's having our baby' And then I blinked, and I remembered. And I slid out of bed as quietly as possible because I thought that if there was a chance that maybe you were dreaming and forgetting, too... well, I didn't want to wake you from that*” (Tilghman, Steinberg, & Olin, 2017, 24:49).

It should be noted that, in matrimonial discourse, partners often use direct speech to predict their spouse's thoughts and in such a way to demonstrate a strong bind between them.

(45) Randall: “*Good. Go ahead. Say 'I told you so'*” Beth: “*I'm not gonna say that. I am gonna say, 'You always start with pest control'*” Randall: “*Okay*” Beth: “*And you always start with pest control because you don't want to go busting through a bunch of drywall when you have a building filled with roaches*” Randall: “*That...*” Beth: “*And then you're gonna say, 'That makes sense' And then you're*

gonna say something charming about how much you love me, and it's gonna almost get you off the hook, but you know what's really gonna get you off the hook?" Randall: *"No, what?"* Beth: *"It's when you say, <u>'I've never owned a building before. But my partner here, she's been working with underserved communities her entire career. She's a real resource to me. I'm gonna utilize my resource'"</u>* Randall: *"I sound smarter when you do me than when I do me"* Beth: *"Yeah, well, that's why it's fun"* (Oyegun, Roos, & Briesewitz, 2018, 28:52).

As can be seen, the strategy for intensifying interest to the addressee is realized with the help of two commonly used linguistic means that constitute positive politeness tactics: the use of a discourse marker *'you know'* and direct speech rather than indirect reported speech.

2.3. Strategies for claiming in-group membership with the addressee

As reported earlier, the higher-order strategy for claiming "*common ground*" is subdivided into three lower-order strategies, which indicate specific wants of the speaker: 1. Convey the addressee's want is admirable, interesting, 2. Claim in-group membership with the addressee, 3. Claim common point of view, opinions, knowledge etc. The first lower-order strategy has been covered earlier and now it is time to dwell upon the next one, which is implemented in matrimonial discourse by the tactic of using in-group identity markers, one of which is address forms.

People use address forms as useful means of building inter-personal interaction, and hence constituting a key part of verbal behaviour which highlights status and intimacy between spouses. Married couples may use different forms to address each other in different contexts. These forms may include:

- the first name:

(46) Kate: "*<u>Tobe</u>, no matter what he says, he's gonna have an amazing, incredible life*" (Fogelman & Olin, 2019, 44:13);

- a title used in a humorous way:

(47) Rebecca: "*How about an hors d'oeuvre to tide you over, <u>good sir?</u>*" Jack: "*Thanks*" (Johnson, Windsor, & Ventimiglia, 2019, 6:52);

- a kinship term:

(48) Jack: "*There she is. Yeah. There's <u>my wife</u>*" Rebecca: "*There I am. Okay. Okay. Go*" Jack: "*I'll be right back*" Rebecca: "*Thank you*" (Squire & Busfield, 2017, 28:30);

(49) Rebecca: "*Get in the car. Get in the car, Jack. You are <u>my husband</u>, and I am <u>your wife</u>, and if you have a problem, we will fix it together. I just need you to get in the car. So, we can go home*" (Fogelman & Olin, 2017, 39:22);

(50) Randall: *"You know, a son wouldn't totally suck. We do make good kids"* Beth: *"That we do, that we do"* Randall: "*The girls will love it"* Beth: *"Oh, they'll go nuts"* Randall: *"Hey"* Beth: "*Hmm?"* Randall: *"What has two thumbs and loves <u>his wife</u> so much it hurts?"* Beth: *"Oh, it does work better with two thumbs"* Randall: *"Nah. I like the way you do it"* (Lawson & Tillman, 2016, 28:01);

(51) Kate: *"Hi"* Toby: *"Hey, there's my <u>maybe-mama</u>"* Kate: *"Morning <u>maybe-daddy</u>"* (Steinberg & Koch, 2018, 8:19);

- a noun denoting gender:

(52) Beth: *"How long is your crack-addict biological daddy gonna be sleeping in our six-year-old daughter's bedroom?"* Randall: *"Damn"* Beth: *"I know, right?"* Randall: *"You need to censor yourself, <u>woman</u>. It's just got real"* (Fogelman & Olin, 2016, 3:58);

(53) Beth: *"Do not get excited. Hold on. Okay, the last time you got excited, it was Vanity Fair calling to see if we wanted to renew our subscription"* Randall: *"I know. I didn't..."* Beth: *"And the time before that, it was the wrong number looking for 'Johnny'"* Randall: *"I know. We should get rid of the landline"* Beth: *"So I'm gonna answer this phone, okay? But I am sure it is not an agent calling with a kid for us"* Randall: *"Oh, my God. Answer the phone, <u>woman</u>"* (Aptaker, Berger, Requa, & Ficarra, 2017, 4:12);

(54) Randall: *"Hey, Beth..."* Beth: *"I know. It's crazy. People are gonna think it's crazy"* Randall: *"Child, please. When have we ever listened to people?"* (Falls, O'Brien, & Koch, 2019, 39:05);

(55) Toby: *"If you want to eat the muffin, kid, eat the muffin"* Kate: *"I don't want to"* Toby: *"Well, I didn't make it to be a TV hood ornament. That right there is the healthiest poppy seed muffin you will ever eat. I made it with whole wheat, unsweetened almond milk and grape-seed oil. It is so healthy, in fact, it hardly qualifies as a muffin"* (Herbert & Olin, 2017, 5:03).

It is quite interesting to note that there are instances when partners use third-person reference forms in self-reference, which are designed to display that the speaker is talking about themselves as if from the perspective of another, that is the addressee. By formulating a self-reference using a form generally dedicated to third-person reference, the speaker can propose that they are authoring the view or viewpoint of someone other than themselves. This develops Schegloff's suggestion that the use of third-person reference forms in self-reference can be "a device for shifting the footing which the speaker marks himself as having with respect to what he is articulating" (Schegloff, 1996, p. 473).

(56) Rebecca: *"We are here because your wife... do you remember her?"* Jack: *"I think so, yeah"* Rebecca: *"The one that you love more than life itself?"* Jack: *"Definitely rings a bell. Got it"* Rebecca: *"She wants to take a look at this place"* Jack: *"Okay, I'm looking"* (Brunstetter, & Zisk, 2016, 14:44);

(57) Rebecca: *"I already feel guilty about leaving them, and you"* Jack: *"Yeah, well, we're gonna be fine. Now give your husband a kiss because it's Valentine's Day"* Rebecca: *"Fine. Yeah. But only 'cause it's Valentine's Day"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2017, 1:36);

(58) Randall: *"Yeah. I know that this is a big anniversary for you guys, you know, with your father having passed away ... Kate wallows, Kevin avoids. But this was my dad's favorite day, so I celebrate him. That's how Randall rolls!"* Beth: *"Oh,*

so Third Person Randall's coming to the party, too, today?" Randall: *"Yeah. He got here early"* (Fogelman, Requa, Ficarra, 2018, 12:16);

(59) Kate: *"I was actually really excited about the idea of being a chorus teacher. All because of eight freaking credits"* Toby: *"Maybe you're just not supposed to be working right now... he said in the most supportive way possible, not meaning it all and regretting it instantly"* (Tilghman, & Olin, 2018, 18:37);

(60) Kate: *"Tobe, no matter what he says, he's gonna have an amazing, incredible life"* Toby: *"Yes, he will, because he has an amazing, incredible mother who's going to give him all of her amazing, incredible traits"* Kate: *"His dad's not so bad"* Toby: *"Is he? Huh?"* Kate: *"Yeah"* Toby: *"Well, maybe his dad will give him his sense of humor. But please, God, please, please, please, God, not his hairline. Grow some hair, please"* (Fogelman & Olin, 2019, 44:15).

Tactics of using a common language code are implemented with the help of such speech tools as conversion of spouses' names to verbs, slang, non-normative lexical units, abbreviations and ellipsis.

As a number of linguistic analyses of the English lexicon have shown, zero-derivation (conversion) is extremely productive in Modern English. Conversion means the derivational process of converting a word from one word class to another. In the following examples, wives transform their husbands' names into verbs with the help of the suffix -ing that indicates a non-finite form (gerund) and a tense (the Present Continuous) of verbs in (62, 63) and (64) respectively.

(61) Rebecca: *"Hey, babe?"* Jack: *"Mm-hmm"* Rebecca: *"I really missed giving you a gift this year"* Jack: *"Yeah?"* Rebecca: *"Yeah. Even if it wasn't gonna be as great as the one you would have given me. I'm sorry for... de-Jacking you"* Jack: *"De-Jacking me?"* (Oyegun & Asher, 2018, 28:43);

(62) Beth: "*Hey. You gonna tell me what's on your mind?"* Randall: *"I just..."* Beth: *"Wh... Why do these forms have you Randalling out so hard? It's pride, right? You don't want to put down on paper that your dad had a drinking problem and your bio dad had a drug problem"* (Fogelman, Brunstetter, & Fortenberry, 2017, 16:38);

(63) Jack: *"What's all this?"* Rebecca: *"I'm Jack Pearsoning you. That's a term I made up for when you sweep someone off their feet. Come on, get in the car"* (Aptaker, Berger, Requa, & Ficarra, 2017, 11:45).

However, not only partners' names but also famous people's ones are transformed into verbs in the conversation between spouses. Their shared knowledge about popular in their culture celebrities, such as the American professional football player and head coach Chuck Noll, strengthens the close bond between them and facilitates harmonious communication.

(64) Rebecca: *"You really think that this trip is gonna help the boys get along better?"* Jack: *"I do"* Rebecca: *"Because Kevin can be so..."* Jack: *"Yep"* Rebecca: *"And Randall is just only trying to help"* Jack: *"I know, baby. It's gonna be great. Look, camping's all about teamwork. Do you remember how the Steelers were a wreck at the start of the season?"* Rebecca: *"You're gonna Chuck Noll the boys?"* Jack: *"I'm gonna Chuck Noll the boys"* Rebecca: *"Okay. Good luck"* Jack: *"Okay"* (Bensinger, Requa, & Ficarra, 2017, 1:55).

Home is the only place where a person can completely relax and give vent to their emotions. As a result, non-normative lexical elements become an element of communication that performs an expressive function and has an emotional load. Wajnryb (2004), for example, lists three basic functions of swearing which she calls: *"cathartic"*, *"abusive"* and *"social"* (p. 26). Cathartic swearing is an emotional outburst, i.e. when angry or in pain; abusive swearing is directed at a specific target whether that be a person or thing; and social fulfils the purpose of joking and strengthening in-group social bonds.

(65) Randall: *"Look, how am I supposed to inspire an auditorium full of strangers, and my own wife and kids don't even understand what I do?"* Beth: *"That's not true"* Randall: *"Really? What do I do?"* Beth: *"You trade weather. You trade commodities based on weather patterns"* Randall: *"And what does that mean?"* Beth: *"Oh, damn, Randall, I don't know. You swap lightning bolts for thunder clouds?"* (Brunstetter, & Zisk, 2016, 10:48);

(66) Randall: "*We were gonna have fun, and then she would feel good, and we could talk. And instead I just made things a whole lot worse for her*" Beth: "*Can't believe you were gonna throw down with some <u>jackass</u> in bowling shoes*" (Herbert & Olin, 2017, 16:27);

(67) Randall: "*Life feels like Pac-Man... sometimes, I guess. It's the same game over and over again. Same board, same ghosts. Sometimes you get a bunch of cherries, but eventually, inevitably, those ghosts catch up with you*" Beth: "*<u>Damn</u>*" Randall: "*Hmm?*" Beth: "*That's <u>bleak as hell</u>, babe*" Randall: "*Or... is it beautiful?*" Beth: "*Nah, it's bleak*" Randall: "*Well, you're beautiful*" Beth: "*Mm, rose-colored glasses*" Randall: "*Still beautiful*" (Tilghman & Olin, 2017, 31:02);

(68) Toby*: "What? Who was that?"* Kate*: "It was the house band that I sent my demo to"* Toby: *"<u>Shut up</u>"* (Fogelman, Brunstetter, & Fortenberry, 2017, 17:43);

(69) Kate: *"But will you come with me? I have a surprise for you"* Toby: *"Ooh"* Kate: *"Uh-huh"* Toby: *"I like surprises"* Kate: *"This is for you"* Toby: *"Oh, look. It's a used bow tie"* Kate: *"Oh, not just any used bow tie. This was worn by Leslie Nielsen in Naked Gun 33⅓: The Final Insult. So"* Toby: *"<u>Shut your freaking face</u>. Leslie Nielsen wore this?"* Kate: *"Yeah"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2018, 1:36).

The next lexical tool, which is quite common in the matrimonial discourse, is abbreviations. The use of abbreviations in dialogues is associated with the rapid spread of social networks. In the next example, Beth uses the abbreviation "*convo*" instead of the full word "*conversation*".

(70) Randall: "*And yes, I wanted to adopt. Got my head around that months ago... adopting a newborn, clean-slate baby, like I was when my parents found me, but I'm worried, Beth*" Beth: *"Because that's what you do, Randall. You worry, babe. But we have talked about this a lot, and we discussed how difficult it could be, and we came to a decision. And now I'm jet-lagged, you got me out here sweating, and I traveled across country to miss the taping of a sitcom that I didn't want to come see in the first place. So, can we please just table <u>the convo</u> until we get home? Please"* (Fogelman, Brunstetter, & Fortenberry, 2017, 24:35).

Quite common in the matrimonial discourse is the abbreviation 'Cause (because):

(71) Rebecca: "*We move in with them. 'Cause they have all that space, and, you know, we could save money, live with them for a year or two*" (Squire & Busfield, 2017, 26:10);

(72) Rebecca: "*I don't know. 'Cause the truth is, when I close my eyes and I think about our future... I see us with kids, Jack*" (Lawson & Tillman, 2016, 33:50).

Analysis of the speech of spouses makes it possible to identify such a trend as the active use of elliptical sentences. An ellipse is understood as avoiding a subject or predicate that can be easily reconstructed using context. The use of elliptical sentences signals that the interlocutors have common knowledge and good understanding of each other, for example:

(73) Jack: "*Hey, you know what? I'm really, really excited about your show tonight*" Rebecca: "*You are?*" Jack: "*Yeah. Really excited. Hmm. But don't get too tired from all the singing, okay? 'Cause I still want to take you out to O'Shannon's for dinner. Unless you want to shake things up...*" Rebecca: "*No, no. Only O'Shannon's on Valentine's Day. That's our tradition. Best bacon cheeseburgers in all of Pittsburgh*" Jack: "*You getting the onion rings?*" Rebecca: "*Hell yes, we're doing onion rings*" Jack: "*Cool wife*" Rebecca: "*Hot hubby*" (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2017, 2:00);

(74) Jack: "*Hey, can you turn the light out, babe?*" Rebecca: "*I just realized we didn't eat dinner tonight, Jack*" Jack: "*I had a pretty big lunch; I'm good*" Rebecca: "*Well, I'm gonna go make myself something then*" Jack: "*The light, babe*" (Steinberg & Howard, 2016, 38:56).

To sum it up, tactics of using a common language code are implemented through linguistic means, which include slang expressions, profanity, abbreviations and elliptical sentences.

2.4. Strategies for claiming common point of view, opinions, attitudes, etc.

To achieve the establishment of good relationships the addressor may resort to the strategy "*Claim common point of view, opinions, attitudes, etc.*", which is realized through the following tactics: "*Seek agreement*", "*Avoid disagreement*", and "*Joke*".

The tactic of seeking agreement allows the addressor to emphasize that they agree with the addressee's opinion thus satisfying their desire to be "*right*". One of the most often used linguistic means to show this agreement are adverbs *"too"* and *"(n)either"*.

(75) Rebecca: "*I can't stop thinking about the one we lost, Jack. I can't*" Jack: *"I know..."* Rebecca: *"I know we have these new babies, and I should be happy, but I just can't stop thinking about him"* Jack: *"Me, too"* Rebecca: *"Yeah?"* Jack: *"Yeah. That's all I think about. I feel... I feel guilty when I think about him, and then, you know, I-I feel guilty when I stop thinking about him"* Rebecca*: "Me, too. I thought it was just me"* Jack*: "No. It's me, too"* Rebecca*: "I love you"* Jack*: "I love you, too"* (Fogelman, Requa, & Ficarra, 2016, 38:10);

(76) Rebecca: "*I'm sorry, I know I'm being a bad sport, but I just... I love our house, Jack. Even if it's old and too small and doesn't get enough light, and there isn't any room to grow basil, it's... it's our house"* Jack: *"Okay, so we're just gonna stay there forever?"* Rebecca: *"Sounds pretty good to me"* Jack: *"Me, too. Yeah, I just wanted to hear you say it"* (Oyegun & Koch, 2018, 32:15);

(77) Randall: "*Hey, Beth, we don't have to go through this again if you don't want to, but…"* Beth: *"I want to"* Randall: *"Yeah?"* Beth*: "Yeah. I mean, maybe not, like, today, or tomorrow, or next month, but... we have a good home. We should bring another child into it. Even if it means losing 'em all over again"* Randall*: "I think so, too. There's another kid out there who needs us. Maybe a boy this time"* Beth*: "A boy, huh?"* Randall*: "I don't know. Not in charge of destiny"* (Tilghman & Olin, 2017, 38:55);

(78) Toby: "*I didn't like hearing the doctor talk about how it was dangerous for you"* Kate*: "I was scared, too. And it probably wouldn't have worked anyway"*

Toby*: "I was hoping you'd change your mind on the whole thing. You know, the-the expense, the hormones, all of it. I just wasn't feeling it"* Kate*: "Me either"* (Fogelman, Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2018, 35:21);

The partner also gives a short but very meaningful answer *"I know"* to convey their agreement and support to their interlocutor.

(79) Randall: "*It didn't go so great"* Beth*: "Yeah?"* Randall: *"I was really hoping for a win today"* Beth*: "I know. Zoe and Kevin are doing it"* Randall*: "Yeah?"* Beth*: "I had to say something"* Randall*: "I know"* (Fogelman, Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2018, 26:56);

(80) Kate: "*I cannot believe that I haven't talked to Kevin in over a month. We've never, ever gone this long without talking"* Toby*: "Yeah, I know, babe. Disconnecting is kind of one of the key rules of rehab"* (Herbert & Koch, 2018, 2:26);

(81) Kate: "*Toby, I... I can't get pregnant again. I mean, not with all the complications and..."* Toby: *"I know"* Kate: *"... the risks"* Toby: *"No. I know. I know. But the Pearsons have a pretty good track record with adoption, don't they?"* (Fogelman & Olin, 2020, 23:30).

So, the addressor anticipates and satisfies the desire of the interlocutor to be sure that their opinion is truthful. Consensus-seeking tactics are also implemented by showing understanding of the addressee's opinion. Lexical means of realization of this tactics are adverbs and phrases that express understanding and confidence, such as: *totally, exactly, absolutely, of course, all right, certainly, surely, yeah* etc.:

(82) Rebecca: "*I know we're not Shelly and Miguel"* Jack*: "No. You're right"* Rebecca*: "We need to take the time to remember the newlyweds that lived here"* Jack*: "Mm-hmm. Yeah"* Rebecca*: "'Cause I miss them sometimes"* Jack*: "I miss them, too"* (Oyegun & Tillman Jr., 2017, 36:00);

(83) Randall: "*That ends today"* Beth: *"By 'today' I hope you mean 'over the course of several months as we gradually improve the building'"* Randall: *"Yes, you're right. You're right, I've been watching too much Property Brothers"* (Oyegun, Roos, & Briesewitz, 2018, 3:30);

(84) Randall: "*Can we just do our thing? Where we say all the bad things that we're thinking; no judgment, no censorship?*" Beth: *"You want to play worst-case scenario now?"* Randall: *"I just got to get it out of my system"* Beth*: "<u>All right</u>, let's do it"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2018, 4:10);

(85) Kate: "*I wanted to surprise you with him*" Toby*: "Yeah?"* Kate*: "But then I started thinking about having a dog and how that would remind me every day..."* Toby*: "Oh, <u>yeah</u>. No, no. Don't-don't, don't worry about it. I to... I <u>totally</u> get it. It's-it's <u>totally fine</u>"* (Oyegun, Roos, & Briesewitz, 2018, 33:40);

(86) Kate: "*Listen, all of this is big news, and it's still early. And I-I don't want to talk about risks or hormone shots with my mom, so let's not say anything to my family*" Toby: *"<u>Yeah, I guess you're right</u>. Some things are best kept between a husband and his wife and his Lyft driver"* (Oyegun & Koch, 2018, 8:09);

(87) Kate: "*So, I was thinking, we're just using this room – to store all of our junk, you know?*" Toby: *"Um, junk..."* Kate: *"I think it's time that we turn this room into a nursery"* Toby*: "<u>I am so on board</u>"* (Kenar & Dawson, 2019, 5:26).

Widely represented in the matrimonial discourse are repetitions, which are confirmation of the fact that the recipient has clearly understood the opinion of the interlocutor, agrees with it and is ready to support it.

(88) Jack*: "You know what I think?"* Rebecca: *"Hmm?"* Jack: "*I think, if I saw you in school, everything else would disappear. All of a sudden, none of it would have mattered, not my dad's drinking or my parents fighting. I would have walked right up to you and said... Hi. And that would've been it. Happily ever after"* Rebecca*: "Really?"* Jack: *"Mm-hmm"* Rebecca*: "<u>Just like that?</u>"* Jack*: "<u>Just like that</u>"* (Herbert & Tillman Jr., 2019, 40:02);

(89) Jack: "*Hey, cranberry looks great*" Rebecca: *"I know. Great is not good enough, <u>it has to be perfect</u>. Because my sister's sweet potato pie is gonna be perfect, and I can't stand to hear my mother's passive-aggressive BS if my sauce is not absolutely perfect"* Jack: *"<u>Perfect</u>. Babe, <u>it is perfect. It is, it's perfect</u>. Or, as your mother would say, 'Becky, it's to die for'"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Anderson, 2016, 1:14);

(90) Randall*: "All right, if I'm not homophobic, then why does it make me feel so weird every time William talks about Jessie"* Beth*: "Because you thought you were getting to know him. And <u>this</u>, admittedly<u>, is a curveball</u>"* Randall*: "<u>It is. It's a big, gay curveball</u>"* (Squire & Busfield, 2017, 9:07);

(91) Randall*: "Beth... I'm sorry I spent too much time working on my vows. As you well know, sometimes I overthink thing"* Beth*: "<u>Overthink everything</u>"* Randall*: "All right, you're right. As you know, sometimes <u>I overthink everything</u>. But not with you"* (Oyegun, & Hooks, 2019, 22:40).

In addition to demonstrating the addressor's understanding of their addressee's phrases, such repetitions testify to their agreement on an emotional level and interest in the topic under discussion. Thus, the tactics of seeking agreement helps bring communicators closer and harmonize their communication.

In contrast to the tactics of seeking agreement, the essence of the tactics of avoiding disagreement is that the addressor aims to formally agree with the addressee and hide his disagreement with them. The tactics of formal consent are universal and are represented in various discourses by phrases that seem to indicate agreement with the interlocutor. In other words, the remark is constructed in such a way to avoid direct expression of one's own opinion. Most often, this tactic is implemented using the phrases *yes, but, I mean, I don't know but I think ...*, etc.

(92) Rebecca*: "Have you noticed that everything Kate says she loves about this place happens to involve food?"* Jack*: "Nah, she was talking about the fire pit"* Rebecca*: "<u>Yeah. In reference to popcorn and s'mores</u>"* Jack*: "Come on. It's vacation, all right? And she has... baby weight"* Rebecca*: "But she's not a baby anymore, Jack. I-I don't want to make her self-conscious, but she's obsessed with food. And the doctor says that she's heavier than most girls her age"* Jack*: "<u>Yeah, but that doctor, he's basing it off of charts, not our actual kid</u>, who takes after my grandmother, who's just... – she was big-boned"* Rebecca: *"Ugh! See, we've been doing this same dance for years, Jack. I say that it's an issue, and you say things like 'big-boned' and 'it's fine'"* (Herbert & Koch, 2018, 9:27);

(93) Rebecca*: "We joke about it. Right? Did I not get the joke? I'm not..."* Jack*: "Babe, <u>you're right. You are right</u>. And coming from the family that-that I did, I definitely never saw myself having kids. Okay. <u>But then I met you</u>. And, you know, we're j... we're great together and I love our life. <u>But the older we get, the more I think that...</u> the more I think there's got to be something bigger than just me and you"* (Lawson & Tillman, 2016, 16:42);

(94) Rebecca: *"I can't believe we're not gonna play pin-the-tail-on-the-donkey this year"* Jack: *"And we're probably never gonna play it again, huh? Wow"* Rebecca*: "Hey, Jack?"* Jack: *"Yeah"* Rebecca*: "<u>I think this whole thing is really sweet, but</u> in less than 12 hours we're gonna have 45 kids here for three different birthday parties, so maybe a little less reminiscing... ... a little bit more bedazzling"* Jack*: "Yep"* Rebecca: *"Thank you"* (Lawson, Brunstetter, & Koch, 2017, 10:12);

(95) Rebecca: *"I don't remember the last time I was this nervous"* Jack: *"Oh, it's just rehearsal, right?"* Rebecca: *"<u>Yeah, but it's my first rehearsal in ten years</u>"* Jack*: "You're gonna do great, babe"* (Steinberg & Howard, 2016, 8:21);

(96) Jack: *"I mean, Randall talks about Mr. Lawrence constantly. You're not the least bit curious about him?"* Rebecca: *"<u>Sure. But</u> I can also wait for parent/teacher conferences in a month."* Jack: *"Bec"* Rebecca: *"Okay. Okay. Okay"* (Oyegun, & Olin, 2019, 5:00);

(97) Randall*: "I mean, Deja's 13 years old, and I got to take her to visit a woman who thinks it's perfectly fine to drive her daughter around with an unlicensed gun in the glove compartment"* Beth*: "<u>I know you're not looking forward to this, babe, but it's court-ordered</u>"* Randall*: "The woman's a criminal"* Beth: *"Who's also her mother"* (Oyegun & Koch, 2017, 4:42);

(98) Beth*: "You know, I'm sorry about the campaign, baby. But maybe this is a blessing, you know, - that-that it's over"* Randall: *"Hey. You know what they say, it's not over till it's over"* Beth: *"<u>Sorry, babe, but it-it feels like it's over</u>"* Randall*: "But he didn't say I should drop out"* Beth*: "Not in those words, but..."* (Tilghman & Olin, 2018, 36:12);

(99) Kate*: "Babe, um <u>I'm really glad that you're so excited. But</u> before you go down this rabbit hole, um I just 6 This kind of therapy is not gonna work for Jack. With this little girl, I mean, she has an inherited disease. She doesn't have a detached or damaged retina like Jack does"* Toby: *"Okay"* (Kenar & Hartley, 2020, 3:05).

Hedging in the mitigation function is also used to avoid disagreement. It should be noted that J. Holmes (1988) distinguishes between softening and facilitative functions of hedging. The researcher considers the softening function of hedging in the context of the strategy of negative politeness, which consists in "caring for the feelings of the addressee, mitigating the illocutionary power of critical and directive statements" (p. 454), and facilitative – as a strategy of positive politeness, which consists in "expressing solidarity and a positive attitude of the speaker to the addressee through the inclusion of the addressee in the communicative process" (p. 447-454). Common means used in the matrimonial discourse to avoid expressing one's opinion in case of disagreement are *sort of, kind of; like, in a way*:

(100) Beth: *"You talk to your sister yet?"* Randall: *"I texted her this afternoon. She has yet to respond"* Beth: *"Was your text an apology?"* Randall: *"<u>Sort of</u>"* Beth: *"Randall"* Randall*: "Hmm?"* Beth*: "She is having surgery tomorrow, okay? I love you, boo, but you overstepped. And you <u>kind of</u> have trouble apologizing to your siblings"* (Brownell & Asher, 2018, 11:24);

(101) Toby: *"Between all of the breaking up and the getting back together, and the having a heart attack two minutes after getting back together... which was terrible timing on my part, I must admit... our relationship has been <u>a bit of</u> a wild ride"* Kate: *"Yeah, I mean, it has... <u>kind of</u> been a roller coaster"* Toby: *"Oh. <u>Kind of?</u> We're, we're talking about getting married this summer and there's still so much that we don't know about each other"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2017, 11:24).

The expression of formal consent is also realized by repeating the phrase, while the interlocutor changes the latter so as not to express their disagreement and not to use the negative particle *"no"*.

(102) Rebecca*: "There are three human beings inside of me, Jack. And they're all lining up to go down the waterslide, and we don't have anything done for them*

yet" Jack: *"We have cribs. And we-we have Big Three onesies"* Rebecca*: "We have cribs inside a barely finished house that is littered with moving boxes"* (Fogelman, Kenar, & Olin, 2017, 2:11);

(103) Jack: *"I know... I know we haven't been on the same page lately. That we just got to get back on track, baby. So... consider this a... way-too-expensive peace offering"* Rebecca: *"I think we've been more than off track"* (Fogelman & Olin, 2016, 19:04);

(104) Randall*: "I told my mother I understand"* Beth*: "Understanding and forgiveness are two very different animals. The adult in you is probably all good, but the little boy in you is still hurt"* Randall*: "So I got him a boat. You're welcome, little boy"* (Todd & Hunt, 2016, 25:47);

(105) Kate: *"My mom thinks you're great"* Toby: *"Uh, your mom thinks I'm a guy who has heart attacks and falls through coffee tables"* (Fogelman, Brunstetter, & Fortenberry, 2017, 7:55);

(106) Kate: *"So why don't we want to know the sex of the baby?"* Toby*: "Because we like surprises"* Kate: *"Tobe, we hate surprises. Do you remember Madison's birthday, when that guy jumped out of the cake and you peed a little?"* Toby*: "Okay, human beings are not supposed to be in baked goods"* (Tilghman & Olin, 2018, 18:37);

(107) Kate*: "I just want him to take one bite of the banana. He should've tried solid food at least two weeks ago"* Toby*: "Here's a theory. Maybe baby doesn't like banana"* Kate*: "Everybody likes banana. It's the healthy snack – that comes in its own wrapper"* (Mastai & Asher, 2019, 6:49).

Sometimes, there are moments in the marriage when one of the spouses has to disagree to support their partner.

(108) Rebecca*: "I don't know what's wrong with me"* Jack*: "God, there's nothing wrong with you, Bec"* (Lawson & Tillman, 2016, 30:54);

(109) Rebecca*: "We can't afford that car"* Jack: *"We can. He gave us a pretty good deal. It's just a little bit more than what we wanted to spend, but we're okay"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2018, 4:21);

(110) Rebecca*: "We're gonna screw them up"* Jack*: "<u>No</u>"* Rebecca*: "Yeah."* Jack*: "<u>No, we're not. No, the kids are gonna be fine</u>. We've shown them a healthy marriage. This is just gonna be a blip on their radar years from now. We're their parents, Bec. We do the best we can. But at the end of the day... what happens to them, how they turn out...that's bigger than us"* (Fogelman, Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2017, 35:17);

(111) Randall: *"I mean, what the hell is wrong with me, Beth? Am I homophobic?"* Beth*: "<u>You are not homophobic</u>"* Randall*: "Well, how do you know?"* Beth*: "Because you're good, and you're open-minded, that's why. Plus, your favorite coworker is gay"* Randall*: "Keith's not gay"* Beth: *"Really?"* Randall: *"No, he's French Canadian"* Beth*: "It's confusing. Damn"* (Squire & Busfield, 2017, 9:07);

(112) Randall*: "Beth, I didn't make a mistake by bringing a dying man into their lives, did I? It's not gonna break 'em, is it?"* Beth*: "<u>No, you didn't make a mistake</u>. Look, you brought them joy. It was a good thing. Hey, look at me. Are you okay?"* Randall*: "Yes"* Beth*: "Okay"* (Oyegun & Tillman Jr., 2017, 29:40);

(113) Kate*: "Are you scared to tell your mom that her Catholic son is having a baby out of wedlock?"* Toby: *"Am I scared?"* Kate*: "Mm-hmm"* Toby*: "<u>No. I am terrified</u>. Do you remember how she reacted when we told her that we were moving in together?"* Kate: *"Yeah. A lot of tears. But she... you know, she got over it"* Toby: *"Yes, she did. But bun in the unmarried oven is like a whole new level of freak out"* (Oyegun & Koch, 2017, 14:56);

(114) Toby: *"Hi. Oh, what is your name?"* Kate: *"Say 'Audio'. Uh, we can change it if you don't like it"* Toby: *"Audio? Yeah. <u>No, I love it</u>. It's like some weird, obnoxious celebrity baby name"* (Oyegun, Roos, & Briesewitz, 2018, 33:40).

Thus, the illocutionary task of speech acts, which implement the tactics of avoiding disagreement, is the desire of the addressors to help the addressee understand their unwillingness to disagree with the latter. According to O. Malaya (2008), the use of "this strategy is due to the speaker's desire to emphasize their difference from the addressee only in a certain aspect – the point of view that led to

disagreement, and declare their desire to be friendly to the interlocutor in general" (p. 123). Linguistic means to implement tactics of avoiding disagreement in facilitating hedges, as well as syntactic means such as constructions with the opposite conjunction *but*, repetition of part of the addressor's narrative in the form of interrogation are used.

The last but not the least important tactics that implement the local strategy for claiming common point of view, opinions, attitudes, etc. is the tactics of joking. The ability of humor to create, maintain and reinforce solidarity among interlocutors is often described its most important function of humor which is central to all instances. This function is particularly relevant in relation to establishing and signalling membership in different groups – be it a family (Everts, 2003), a circle of friends or a workplace team. Since different groups have developed distinct ways of using humor, using humor appropriately is an important aspect of signalling group membership, and of establishing boundaries among different groups.

The humorous effect can be achieved through a variety of stylistic means, such as:

- pun, in which one word-form is deliberately used in two meanings:

(115) Toby*: "Oh, oh, make sure that you ask, uh, 'When will the baby move?' so that I can say, <u>'Hopefully, as soon as he turns 20'</u>"* Kate*: "As soon as he turns 20"* Toby: *"Yeah"* Kate: *"Or she"* Toby*: "Yeah. Uh, joke still works"* (Tilghman, Steinberg, & Olin, 2017, 4:19);

- metaphor — transference of names based on the associated likeness between two objects (Kukharenko, 2000, p. 22):

(116) Toby: *"The Brothers Pearson are all mine this weekend. I got <u>one scoop of dark chocolate Pearson, and one scoop of creamy vanilla Pearson, and <u>I'm gonna be the ruddy strawberry</u> that brings it all together, baby"* (Kenar & Kerns, 2018, 8:45);

- hyperbole – a stylistic device in which emphasis is achieved through deliberate exaggeration (Kukharenko, 2000, p. 31):

(117) Rebecca: *"You really tried crying?"* Jack: *"Oh, yeah. Just full waterworks... like a little boy"* (Squire & Busfield, 2017, 8:56);

- rhetorical question – a challenging statement conveying the obviousness of the speaker's answer or, on the contrary, the speaker's inability to respond (Schaffer, 2005, p. 434)

(118) Rebecca*: "Baby, I can't do it"* Jack*: "Oh, come on. Kids are turning ten tomorrow, right? They don't need more toys, but a dog. Baby, our beautiful children need a beautiful dog"* Rebecca*: "Okay. Get them a dog. Okay. And then get them a new mommy who will walk it"* Jack: *"That's fair enough, but, um... do you, uh, do you want to interview these women, or do you trust my judgment?"* Rebecca: *"Oh, you're lucky you're cute. But am I cute enough to get lucky? I don't know, are you?"* (Lawson, Brunstetter, & Koch, 2017, 1:40);

(119) Kate*: "Do we have everything? Just want to get there early so he's comfortable with the space"* Toby*: "Yeah, I've got extra diapers and wipes, both pacifiers, two changes of clothes, a UV blanket, a stylish hat, a practical hat, a cooler full of backup milk. How did the cavemen do this?"* (Brownell & Koch, 2019, 1:39);

- defeated expectancy, which is decoded as violation of the linearity of language, i.e. when elements of low predictability appear in the context of the ordered elements. Such low elements are always unpredictable, that is why they require enhanced activity and attention of the reader (Arnold, 1999, p. 239).

(120) Randall: *"What do you want me to say, babe? That he was irresponsible? That he made some terrible decisions? That I came within two inches of separating his perfectly-coiffed head from his body?"* Beth: *"That part"* (Herbert & Koch, 2018, 4:44);

(121) Beth: *"Look at my feet. What do you see?"* Randall: *"A couple hundred dollars on the Amex"* Beth: *"Mm-mmm. Open toe shoes for an open mind. See, the only way we're gonna get through this is to have an open mind. And red wine. Lots of red wine"* (Oyegun & Olin, 2019, 7:20);

(122) Toby: *"Um... but I have done a lot of work on myself since then. You know, I have single-handedly financed my therapist's new Tesla. And now... he has a new car and I am in the best place I've ever been"* (Aptaker, Berger, & Olin, 2017, 19:57).

There is also a tendency for husbands to resort to self-deprecating humour, which comes into being when the speaker pokes fun at themselves.

(123) Toby*: "Well, are we rich?* Kate*: "These kids at my college, they went crazy for our stuff"* Toby: *"Yeah, well, we're so old to them, our stuff is considered vintage"* (Kenar & Dawson, 2019, 9:20);

(124) Kate*: "Oh, wait, I thought, I was gonna get to see you all dressed up in your new client-wooing suit"* Toby*: "What, and risk sweat stains before I even get to the office? I'm not a daredevil. I know my body's limits"* (Herbert & Fletcher, 2019, 7:54).

The prevalence of jokes in the matrimonial discourse suggests that interlocutors share tactics of joking and use them to promote friendliness and maintain harmonious communication. Among the linguistic means used to implement these tactics are pun, metaphor, hyperbole, rhetorical question, and defeated expectancy.

Conclusions to Chapter Two

The matrimonial dialogical discourse involves the use of a category of politeness, in particular, the politeness of rapprochement, which aims to demonstrate the speaker's emphasized attention to the listener. Among the wide range of positive politeness strategies, the spouses often resort to the following ones: *"Notice, attend to the addressee (their interests, wants, needs, goods)"*, *"Exaggerate (interest,*

approval, sympathy with the addressee", *"Intensify interest to the addressee"*, *"Use in-group identity markers"*, *"Seek agreement"*, *"Avoid disagreement",* and *"Joke"*.

These strategies can be classified into three groups, which state the addressor's specific wants, and can be realized in speech with the help of various linguistic means. For example, the speaker may resort to one of the first three strategies to express their genuine admiration of and great interest in their interlocuter. The following linguistic means help the addressor pay their compliments to the addressee and positively evaluate them: emotionally coloured adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees, adverbs intensifiers, comparative construction with *like*, and the use of a discourse marker *'you know'* and direct speech rather than indirect speech in their narratives.

The addressor's want to claim in-group membership with the addressee can be conveyed with the help of the strategy *"Use in-group identity markers",* which is realized in address forms, zero-derivation of verbs from proper nouns, expletives, abbreviations and elliptical sentences.

The last three strategies, i. e. *"Seek agreement", "Avoid disagreement"*, and *"Joke"* may be resorted to in those cases when the addressor wants to reinforce that they share common point of view, opinions and attitudes with the addressee. Such linguistic means as adverbs *'too'* and *'(n)either'*; adverbs of manner *totally, exactly, absolutely, certainly, surely*; repetitions; the phrases *yes, but, I mean, I don't know but I think…*, hedges *sort of, kind of, like, in a way* as well as stylistic means, such as *pun, metaphor, hyperbole, rhetorical question*, and *defeated expectancy* are characteristic for these strategies and commonly used in the matrimonial discourse.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The present Paper aims to analyze linguistic means of implementing positive politeness strategies and tactics in modern English dialogic discourse on the material of the American TV series *This Is Us*. Linguistic politeness can be defined as ways to use language in conversation to show attention to the interlocutors' feelings and desires, as well as to create and maintain interpersonal relationships.

The explanation of this concept was approached from different disciplinary angles, but as a theoretical foundation for our study, we used politeness theory, proposed by P. Brown and S. Levinson, according to which politeness is based on the concept of "face", which is associated with two contradictory wants: the want to get approval of their actions (positive face) and the want to avoid to be imposed upon by other people's thoughts (negative face). It is these opposing types of face that form the basis for the division of politeness into positive, which is aimed at bringing communicators closer, and negative, which is aimed at showing respect for the interlocutor's independence.

Since marriage is based on harmonious relationships, when partners seek to strengthen their common interests, emphasize their in-group membership and avoid misunderstandings, we considered it appropriate to explore the implementation of such strategies of positive politeness as:

- *"Notice, attend to the addressee (their interests, wants, needs, goods)", "Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with the addressee",* and *"Intensify interest to the addressee",* which belong to the local strategy for conveying that the addressee's want is admirable, interesting to the addressor;
- *"Use in-group identity markers",* which is a constituent part of the local strategy for claiming in-group membership with the addressee;
- *"Seek agreement", "Avoid disagreement",* and *"Joke",* which constitute the local strategy for claiming common point of view, opinions, attitudes, etc.

The results of the paper have shown that the most productive linguistic means in verbalizing positive politeness strategies and tactics in matrimonial discourse are lexical means presented by adverbs intensifiers, qualitative adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees, discourse marker *'you know'*, slang expressions, profanity, abbreviations, etc. Among the syntactic means that implement the strategies of positive politeness, a comparative construction with *like* and elliptical sentences are predominant in matrimonial discourse.

RÉSUMÉ

Робота присвячена дослідженню лінгвістичних засобів вираження стратегій і тактик позитивної ввічливості у сучасному англомовному діалогічному дискурсі на матеріалі американського серіалу *«Це Ми»*. Лінгвістичну ввічливість можна визначити як способи використання мови в розмові для виявлення уваги до почуттів та бажань своїх співрозмовників, а також створення та підтримання міжособистісних відносин.

Існує багато лінгвістичних підходів до пояснення цього поняття, але, як теоретичний фундамент для нашого дослідження, ми використали теорію П. Браун та С. Левінсона, згідно якої в основу ввічливості покладено поняття суспільного обличчя, з яким пов'язані два протилежні бажання: бажання отримати схвалення своїх дій (позитивне обличчя) та бажання уникнути нав'язування чужих думок (негативне обличчя). Саме ці суперечливі типи обличчя і лягли в основу поділу ввічливості на позитивну, яка спрямована на зближення комунікантів, та негативну, яка спрямована на прояв поваги та шанобливого ставлення до незалежності співрозмовника.

Оскільки шлюб будується на гармонійних стосунках, коли партнери прагнуть підсилити спільність інтересів, приналежність до однієї групи та уникнення непорозумінь, ми вважали доцільним дослідити реалізацію таким стратегій позитивної ввічливості, як *«Помічай слухача, приділяй увагу йому, його інтересам, бажанням, потребам тощо»*, *«Перебільшуй (інтерес, схвалення, симпатію до співрозмовника)»*, *«Посилюй інтерес до слухача»*, *«Використовуй маркери належності до групи»*, *«Прагни згоди»*, *«Уникай незгоди»* та *«Жартуй»*.

В результаті нашого дослідження ми прийшли до висновку, що найбільш продуктивними у вербалізації стратегій і тактик позитивної ввічливості в матримоніальному дискурсі виявляються лексичні засоби, представлені іменниками, прикметниками у порівняльному та найвищому ступенях порівняння, прислівниками-інтенсифікаторами, числівниками,

сленгом тощо та такі синтаксичні конструкції, як порівняльна конструкція з like та еліптичні речення.

Ключові слова: *politeness theory, positive politeness, dialogical discourse, strategies and tactics of positive politeness.*

LIST OF REFERENCES

Азимов, Э. Г., & Щукин, А. Н. (2009). *Новый словарь методических терминов и понятий (теория и практика обучения языкам)*. Москва: ИКАР.

Арнольд, И. В. (1999). *Семантика. Стилистика. Интертекстуальность*. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство С.-Петербургского университета.

Арутюнова, Н. Д. (1988). *Типы языковых значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт*. Москва: Наука.

Бацевич, Ф. С. (2004). *Основи комунікативної лінгвістики*. Київ: Академія.

Бацевич, Ф. С. (2005). *Лінгвістична генологія: проблеми і перспективи*. Львів: ПАІС.

Белова, А. Д. (2004). Комунікативні стратегії і тактики: проблеми систематики. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: зб. наук. пр*, 10, с. 11-16.

Бенвенист, Э. (1974) *Общая Лингвистика*. Москва: Прогресс.

Борисова, И. (1996). Дискурсивные стратегии в разговорном диалоге. Т. Матвеева (Ред.), *Русская разговорная речь как явление городской культуры* (с. 21-48). Екатеринбург: АРГО.

Бубнова, Г. И. (1987). Текстовые категории устного спонтанного диалога: (на материале фр. яз.). *Вопросы системной организации речи* (с. 47–68) М.: Изд-во МГУ.

Григорьева, В. С. (2007). *Дискурс как элемент коммуникативного процесса: прагмалингвистический и когнитивный аспекты*. Тамбов: Изд-во Тамб. гос. техн. ун-та.

Дейк, Т. А., & Кинч, В. (1988). Стратегии понимания связного текста. *Новое в зарубежной лингвистике: Когнитивные аспекты языка*, 23, с. 153-211.

Ермолаев, Б. А. (2006). *О стратегиях коммуникативного взаимодействия личности и группы. Текст в коммуникации*. Челябинск: Изд-во Челяб. гос. ун-та.

Земская, Е. А. (1994). Категория вежливости в контексте речевых действий. *Логический анализ языка. Язык речевых действий*, 7, с. 131-136.

Іващишин, О. М. (2007). *Англійські термінологічні словосполучення у текстах з проблем техногенного впливу на довкілля*. (Автореф. дис. канд. філол. наук). Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, Львів.

Иссерс, О. С. (2002). *Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.

Карасик, В. И. (1992). *Язык социального статуса*. (Монография). Волгогр. гос. пед. ин-т., Москва.

Карасик, В. И. (1994). Оценочная мотивировка, статус лица и словарная личность. *Филология*, 3, 2-7.

Карасик, В. И. (2000). О типах дискурса. *Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс: сборник научных трудов*, с. 5- 20.

Карасик, В. И. (2002). *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс*. Волгоград: Перемена.

Кашкин, В. Б. (2000). *Введение в теорию коммуникации*. Воронеж: Изд-во ВГТУ.

Кибрик, А. А. (2009) Модус, жанр и другие параметры классификации дискурсов. *Вопросы языкознания*, 2, 3–21.

Киров, Е. Ф. (2001). Язык в системе человеческой деятельности (фрагмент спекулятивной лингвистики). *Теория языкознания и русистика: Сборник статей по материалам международной научной конференции памяти Б.Н. Головина*, 24-26.

Колодько, М. К. (2014). Семантика англійських компліментарних висловлювань у порівнянні з висловлюваннями похвали. *Мовні та концептуальні картини світу: зб. наук. праць*, Ч. 2, 26, с. 84-89.

Красных, В. В. (1999). *Структура коммуникации в свете линrво-когнитивного подхода (коммуникативный акт, дискурс, текст)*. (Дис. д-ра филол. наук). Московский государственный университет имени М. В. Ломоносова, Москва.

Кухаренко, В. А. (2000). *Практикум з стилістики англійської мови*. Вінниця:

Нова книга.

Ларина, Т. В. (2003). Вежливость как национально-специфическая коммуникативная категория. И. Стернин (Ред.), *Коммуникативное поведение: Вежливость как коммуникативная категория* (с. 48-57). Воронеж: Изд-во «Истоки».

Ларина, Т. В. (2009). *Категория вежливости и стиль коммуникации: Сопоставление английских и русских лингвокультурных традиций*. Москва: Рукописные памятники Древней Руси.

Макаров, М. Л. (2003). *Основы теории дискурса*. Москва : Гнозис.

Малая, О. Ю. (2008). *Реалізація мовленнєвих стратегій ввічливості у дискурсі німецькомовних інтернет-форумів*. (Дис. канд. філол. наук). Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, Харків.

Матвеева, Г. Г. (2003). К вопросу о речевых стратегиях скрытого воздействия отправителя текста на его получателя. *Личность, речь и юридическая практика*, 6, 122-128.

Михальская, А. К. (1998). *Педагогическая риторика: история и теория*. М.: Академия.

Мищенко, В. Я. (1997). Классификация речевых актов комплимента. *Вісник Харківського університету: Актуальні проблеми теорії комунікації*, с. 107-111.

Орбан-Лембрик, Л. Е. (2010). *Соціальна психологія*. Книга 1. К.: Академвидав.

Почепцов, Г. Г. (1999). *Теорія комунікації* (2-е вид., допов.). Київ: Вид-во Київ. ун-ту.

Романов, А. А. (1995). Говорящий лидер в деловом общении. *Homo Loques: Язык, культура, познание*, 56-70.

Селиванова, Е. А. (2004). *Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации*. Киев: Брама.

Селіванова, О. О. (2006). *Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія (1290 термінів і понять)*. Полтава: Довкілля-К.

Селіванова, О. О. (2008). *Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми*. Полтава:

Довкілля-К.

Серажим, К. (2002). *Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність (на матеріалах сучасної газетної публіцистики)*. (Монографія). Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Т. Шевченка. Київ.

Сковородников, А. П. (2004). О необходимости разграничения понятий «риторический прием», «стилистическая фигура», «речевая тактика», «речевой жанг» в практике терминологической лексикологии. *Риторика. Лингвистика*, 5, 5-12.

Толмачева, Т. А. (2006). К вопросу о типологии коммуникативных стратегий. *Горный Алтай: проблемы билингвизма в поликультурном пространстве: сборник научных трудов*, с. 159-162.

Труфанова, И. В. (2001). О разграничении понятий: речевой акт, речевой жанр, речевая стратегия, речевая тактика. *Филологические науки*, 3, 56-65.

Флиер, А. Я. (2000). *Культурология для культурологов*. М.: академический проект.

Формановская, Н. И. (2007). *Речевое взаимодействие: коммуникация и прагматика*. Москва: ИКАР.

Фролова, И. Е. (2013). Регулятивный потенциал стратегии конфронтации в англоязычном диалогическом дискурсе: инструментарий и принципы анализа. *Когниция, коммуникация, дискурс*, 7, 111-130.

Фуко, М. (1996). *Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности: Работы разных лет: перевод с французского*. Москва: Касталь.

Чернявская, В. Е. (2002). Дискурс и дискурсивный анализ: традиции, цели, направления. М. Котюрова (Ред.), *Стереотипность и творчество в тексте: межвузовский сборник научных трудов* (с. 122–136). Пермь: Перм. ун-т.

Чхетиани, Т. Д. (1987). *Лингвистические аспекты фатической метакоммуникации*. (Дисс. канд. филол. наук). Киевский государственный педагогический институт, Киев.

Шевченко, І. С. (2005). *Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен*. Харків: Константа.

Юшковець, І. А. (2008). *Комунікативні стратегії і тактики в політичному дискурсі канцлерів ФРН (на матеріалі урядових заяв і політичних виступів)*. (Автореф. дис. канд. філол. наук). Донецький національний університет, Донецьк.

Benveniste, É. (1971) *Problems in general linguistics* (M. E. Meek, Trans.). Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Everts, E. (2003). Identifying a particular family humour style: a sociolinguistic discourse analysis. *Humor*, 16(4), 369-412.

Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27 (1), 93-110.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 219–236. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N

Goffman, E. (1955). On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. *Psychiatry*. 18(3), 213-31. doi:10.1080/00332747.1955.11023008

Grice, P. (1967). Logic and Conversation. In P. Grice (Ed.), *Studies in the Way of Words* (pp. 22-40). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse Analysis. *Language*, 28(1), 1-30. doi:10.2307/409987

Hobbs, P. (2003). The medium is the message: Politeness strategies in men's and women's voice mail messages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 243-262. doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00100-5

Holmes, J. (1988). Paying Compliments: A Sex-Preferential Politeness Strategy.

Journal of Pragmatics, 12(4), 445-465. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(88)90005-7

Ide, S. (1989). Formal Forms and Discernment: Two Neglected Aspects of Universals of Linguistic Politeness. *Multilingua — Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8, 223-248. doi:10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223

Janney, R. W., & Arndt H. (1992). Interactional Tact Versus Intercultural Tact. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History Theory and Practice* (pp. 21-41). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The Logic of Politeness: Or, Minding your P's and Q's. In C. Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark, & A. Weiser (Eds.), *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292-305). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2005). Politeness Theory and Relational Work, *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 9-33. doi:10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9

Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. (1967). Dimensions of Compliance-Gaining Behavior: An Empirical Analysis. *Sociometry*, 30(4), 350-364. doi:10.2307/2786181

Mills, L. (2014) Language, Culture and Politeness. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture* (pp. 129-140). London: Routledge.

Nwoye, O. (1992). Linguistic Politeness and Socio-cultural Variations of the Notion of Face. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(4), 309-328. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(92)90092-P

Schaffer, D. (2005). Can rhetorical questions function as retorts?: Is the Pope Catholic? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 433-460.

Schegloff, E. (1996). Some Practices for Referring to Persons in Talk-in-Interaction: A Partial Sketch of a Systematics. In B.A. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in Anaphora* (pp. 437-85). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1983). Face in interethnic communication. In J. R. Richards, & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 156-188). London: Longman.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (2001). *Intercultural Communication* (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

Tannen, D. (1981). Indirectness in Discourse: Ethnicity as Conversational Style. *Discourse Processes*, 4, 221-238.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Turner, K. (1996). The Principal Principles of Pragmatic Inference: Politeness.

Van de Walle, L. (1993). *Pragmatics and Classical Sanskrit: A Pilot Study in Linguistic Politeness*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing House.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.

Wajnryb, R. (2004). *C U Next Tuesday, a Good Look at Bad Language*. London: Aurum Press.

Watts, R. (1992). Linguistic Politeness and Public Verbal Behavior. In R. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* (pp. 43-70). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. *Language Teaching*, 29(1), 1-13. doi:10.1017/S0261444800008211

Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Anderson, S. P. (Director). (2016, November 22). Pilgrim Rick. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Olin, K. (Director). (2017, February 14). Jack Pearson's Son. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Requa, J., & Ficarra, G. (Directors). (2017, October 10). Déjà Vu. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Olin, K. (Director). (2018, February 6). The Car. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Olin, K. (Director). (2018, March 13). The Wedding. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Olin, K. (Director). (2019, April 2). Her. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Koch, C. (Director). (2019, October 1). The Pool: Part Two. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Bauman, D. (Writer), & Hooks, K. (Director). (2020, January 28). A Hell of a Week: Part Two. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Bensinger, T. (Writer), & Requa, J., & Ficarra, G. (Directors). (2017, October 24). Brothers. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Brownell, J. (Writer), & Asher, R. (Director). (2018, October 9). Katie Girls. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). This Is Us. NBC

Studios.

Brownell, J. (Writer), & Koch, C. (Director). (2019, October 15). Flip a coin [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Brunstetter, B. (Writer), & Zisk, C. (Director). (2016, November 1). Career Days. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Falls, K., & O'Brien, T. (Writers), & Koch, C. (Director). (2019, January 22). Songbird Road (Part 1). [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Falls, K., & Gomez, J. (Writers), & Boyd, S. (Director). (2020, February 25). Clouds. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D. (Writer), & Olin, K. (Director). (2016, September 27). The Big Three. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D. (Writer), & Requa, J., & Ficarra, G. (Directors). (2016, October 11). Kyle. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D., & Kenar, L. (Writers), & Olin, K. (Director). (2017, January 17). The Big Day. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D. (Writer), & Requa, J., & Ficarra, G. (Directors). (2017, February 21). Memphis. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D., Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Olin, K. (Director). (2017, March 14). Moonshadow. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D. (Writer), & Olin, K. (Director). (2017, September 26). A Father's Advice. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*.

NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D., & Brunstetter, B. (Writers), & Fortenberry, J. (Director). (2017, October 3). A Manny-Splendored Thing. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D. (Writer), & Requa, J., & Ficarra, G. (Directors). (2018, February 4). Super Bowl Sunday. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D., Aptaker, I., & Berger, E. (Writers), & Olin, K. (Director). (2018, September 25). Nine Bucks. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D. (Writer), & Olin, K. (Director). (2019, September 24). Strangers. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Fogelman, D. (Writer), & Olin, K. (Director). (2020, March 24). Strangers: Part Two. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Herbert, V. (Writer), & Olin, K. (Director). (2017, October 17). Still There. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Herbert, V. (Writer), & Koch, C. (Director). (2018, January 9). The Fifth Wheel. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Herbert, V. (Writer), & Tillman Jr., G. (Director). (2019, March 19). Don't Take My Sunshine Away. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Herbert, V. (Writer), & Fletcher, A. (Director). (2019, October 8). Unhinged [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Johnson, C., & Windsor, D. (Writers), & Ventimiglia, M. (Director). (2019, October 22). Storybook Love. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan.

(Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Kenar, L. (Writer), & Kerns, J. (Director). (2018, February 27). Vegas, Baby. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Kenar, L. (Writer), & Dawson, R. (Director). (2019, January 15). The Last Seven Weeks. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Kenar, L. (Writer), & Hartley, J. (Director). (2020, February 11). A Hell of a Week: Part Three. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Lawson, J. (Writer), & Tillman, G. (Director). (2016, October 25). The Game Plan. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Lawson, J., & Brunstetter, B. (Writers), & Koch, C. (Director). (2017, January 24). Three Sentences. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Mastai, E. (Writer), & Asher, R. (Director). (2019, November 12). Sorry. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). This Is Us. NBC Studios.

Oyegun, K. (Writer), & Tillman Jr., G. (Director). (2017, February 7). I Call Marriage. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Oyegun, K. (Writer), & Olin, K. (Director). (2019, November 5). The Dinner and the Date. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Oyegun, K. (Writer), & Koch, C. (Director). (2017, November 7). The Most Disappointed Man. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Oyegun, K., & Roos, D. (Writers), & Briesewitz, U. (Director). (2018, January 23). That'll Be the Day. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator).

This Is Us. NBC Studios.

Oyegun, K. (Writer), & Asher, R. (Director). (2018, March 6). This Big, Amazing, Beautiful Life. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Oyegun, K. (Writer), & Koch, C. (Director). (2018, October 2). A Philadelphia Story. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Oyegun, K. (Writer), & Hooks, K. (Director). (2019, March 26). R & B. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). This Is Us. NBC Studios.

Squire, A. (Writer), & Busfield, T. (Director). (2017, January 10). The Right Thing to Do. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Steinberg, K. J. (Writer), & Howard, S. (Director). (2016, November 15). The Best Washing Machine in the World. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Steinberg, K. J., & Herbert, V. (Writers), & Stanzler, W. (Director). (2017, March 7). What Now? [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Steinberg, K. J. (Writer), & Koch, C. (Director). (2018, October 23). Toby. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). This Is Us. NBC Studios.

Tilghman, S. H., & Steinberg, K. J. (Writers), & Olin, K. (Director). (2017, November 21). Number Two. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Tilghman, S. H. (Writer), & Olin, K. (Director). (2017, November 28). Number Three. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Tilghman, S. H. (Writer), & Olin, K. (Director). (2018, November 27). The Beginning Is the End Is the Beginning. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.

Todd, D. (Writer), & Hunt, H. (Director). (2016, December 6). Last Christmas. [Television series episode]. In Fogelman, Dan. (Creator). *This Is Us*. NBC Studios.